The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JANUARY 11, 1906.

The Week.

The President, in a letter, assures Congress that he has "carefully examined" into all the charges of mismanagement at Panama, and found every one to be "without foundation in any shape or form." It is certain, however, that, with whatever zeal he may have confuted outside slanderers, he has not even read the accusations made by his own subordinates. His message went to Congress along with the report of the Panama Commission, which comprises the report of the Chief Engineer, Mr. Stevens. It is plain that Mr. Roosevelt cannot even have glanced at that; otherwise he could not have put himself into such open contradiction of its statements. Parallel columns will show the nature of this collision between the Chief Magistrate and the Chief Engineer:

THE PRESIDENT.	THE ENGINEER.
All the work so far has been done not only with the utmost expedition, but in the most careful and thorough manner.	Thousands of yards of material were loaded and hauled by this equipment, over these tracks, to land dumps, the latter improperly located and in character unsuited to the end in view. Doubtless the original purpose under which this work was undertaken was a wise one, but the long continuance of it, and the utter absence, as far as could be learned, of any thought or attempt to plan a systematic method of handling the work as a whole, would seem to be open to grave criticism.

The part of the message dealing with the high salaries paid by the President's order, might be set as a useful exercise for the first class in logic. First, Mr. Roosevelt tells us, "Men fit for the work will not undertake it unless they are well paid." Presently we learn, "Among the men fit to do the task only those with a genuine sense of public spirit and eager to do the great work for the work's sake can be obtained." But the President's blunder goes deeper than formal logic. He knows, and every one knows, that the chief cause of the outcry against the high salaries he has assigned out of the Panama $10,000,000, was the discovery that he had used one of them to take care of a personal friend. He talks now about the need of high pay for those who have to work in "the peculiar conditions of the tropical land," but the scandal was in his ordering $10,000 a year paid to an intimate who had not to go south of the tropic of Washington, and even there had little or nothing to do. Of that bit of gross favoritism the President became so ashamed that he agreed, on the urging of Republican Senators, to abolish the useless office; but now he rails at "any attempt to cut down the salaries" as "ruinous." Was it ruinous when his waste of the public funds on his crony Bishop was detected, and he was compelled to recede from it? Of course, there will be a Congressional investigation of the whole thing. Senator Hale and Senator Gorman are at one in this. It has long been inevitable. Congress would be criminally negligent if it did not look into the scandals. Secretary Taft himself, in his severe criticism of some of the methods of Chairman Shonts, has just shown how grave are the financial and other irregularities to be inquired into. All the Presidential shouting in the world cannot divert attention from the facts.

Washington dispatches make it clear that there is daily less and less likelihood of the ratification of the Santo Dominican treaty. The President is reported to have consented to "any amendments" in order to secure its adoption, but there is known to be at least one Republican Senator who will not vote for it under any circumstances, in which case at least five Democratic votes will be needed if it is to be ratified. It seems hardly possible that these will be forthcoming; indeed, it is an open secret that there are several Republicans who, if they dared, would also vote against it, not more because of lack of sympathy with the Dominican programme than as a check to an over-hasty President. Meanwhile, every day's delay makes it plainer that if there is one thing the country is not crying for, it is the task of policing the Caribbean, and financially supervising any rotten republic which may appeal for our aid on the theory of danger from a foreign Power. Even the warmest friends of Mr. Roosevelt should welcome a Senatorial checkmate in this matter; it can only make him a more useful President during the rest of his term if it is brought home to him that there are some things which the Executive cannot do by himself, "anyhow."

To find an argument for the derelict Dominican treaty in the flight of Morales and in his subsequent fruitless revolt against his own vice-president, requires ingenuity of the robustly optimistic sort. Morales among the revolutionists, we are now told, actually clears the air. We see that the treaty was no mere gentleman's agreement between Presidents, but a pact between "entities." Morales passes, but the Dominican entity persists with needs as crying as ever. All these things must be interpreted in the light of the benevolent dialectic contained in Mr. Roosevelt's state papers. When he is bent on making a treaty with a nation, he can always see an entity flawless, and, in Bülow's word, eminently "treatyable," though to the eye of flesh some turbulent little country may be giving all the outward tokens of a multiple personality more than Protean. Yet this comfortable confidence must, in Mr. Roosevelt's case, be disturbed by a personal twinge. The treaty was, after all, negotiated with one Carlos Morales.

The House leaders have good reason for apprehension when they take stock of the assets of the present "insurgent" movement. To begin with, the opponents of the Statehood bill and the opponents of the Philippine tariff are different sets of persons, so that a coalition means a clear gain to both sides. Then, for a leader, the dissenting movement has the veteran chairman of the Republican Congressional Committee, on whom every candidate has to depend every other year for a multitude of material and other favors. It has issues, moreover, on which spirited and popular pleas can be made with very little effort, and are not so easy to answer. "We are not opposing Philippine free trade," they say; "we are only insisting that the differential which protects the iniquitous Sugar Trust shall be removed. We are not opposing the creation of new States; we are only striving to prevent the annihilation of a commonwealth that deserves to be made a sovereign State." Of course, the two questions have nothing at all to do with each other, but their pendency at the same time has given the chance, and such is the way of politics.

The tangle over the Statehood bill is evidently taking on a more serious aspect. If the opponents of this bill can effect a combination with the opponents of the Philippine tariff and muster fifty-eight insurgents in all, both these measures can be kept from passing the House. Meanwhile, the early reports that sentiment in Arizona was gradually becoming reconciled to the amalgamation of that Territory with New Mexico, are now being counteracted by such violent and threatening protests as were made at Tucson on Sunday, when David S. Rose, who, though mayor of Milwaukee, is nevertheless a spokesman for the Territory 1,500 miles away, proposed "to let the streets of Tucson run with the blood of martyrs" rather than consent to the "infamous" joint

WESTFIELD ATHENEUM,
WESTFIELD, MASS.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Statehood plan. What appears to us the obviously sensible course—to admit the Oklahoma-Indian Territory State at once and let the Southwestern Territories go for the present—seems hardly to be considered. There are said to be "tactical" considerations which make the two propositions practically inseparable. Just what these considerations are we have never seen explained. If the interests which are trying so hard to keep Arizona intact were also interested in having Oklahoma admitted, there would be an obvious basis for a compromise; but this is not the case. The separate Statehood men in the Southern tier have no more interest in the more northern Territories, as some one has said, than in the canals on Mars. With those Territories admitted, as every one acknowledges they ought to be, the arguments and secret influences in Arizona would be neither more nor less potent than they are to-day.

The fight to exclude liquor from the Indian half of the new State is not based purely on sentimental grounds. Men like Capt. McKennon, a former member of the Dawes Commission, who is a leader of the anti-saloon forces, argue that prohibition for a period of twenty years or more is necessary to the orderly development of the tribes. It is true that there are now six whites to one Indian in the Territory, but there is no logical reason for putting liquor into the hands of the six in order to help them despoil the one—for that is what it comes to. Railway and town-site promoters, land-grabbers, and the simple grafters are arrayed against the Indians to whom the tribal lands have been allotted. To arm these pirates with liquor is to double their destructive power. Even to put one of their tools on the bench is to give them undue advantage. Thus far President Roosevelt has unwittingly aided the spoilers. The Senate should insist upon a thorough airing of Indian Territory politics, and demand of Senator Beveridge the real reason why there is hesitation about carrying out the Government's pledge to keep liquor from the Indians of the Five Tribes.

If the Senate Judiciary Committee, before which the opponents of Luman F. Parker, jr., are urging that his nomination as United States judge for the Northern District of Indian Territory be rejected, is inclined to go into the matter, it will find scandalous material. Briefly, the trouble in the Territory is graft. Young Mr. Parker, son of the general counsel of the " 'Frisco" Railway, with a large mileage in Indian Territory, is only one of the pawns in the game played by the railway promoters and the Western saloon and brewing interests. Whether it is true or not that Parker, while acting as Assistant District Attorney, was in actual criminal alliance with the whiskey-sellers and brewers, does not matter except as it affects his own case. The fact that these interests are powerful enough to secure such an appointment, and to keep a man like Pliny L. Soper to the fore in the discussion of Senators for the new State, is sufficient cause for anxiety. While the Statehood bill is on the very threshold of Congress, no provision has yet been made for securing continued prohibition in that portion of the new State which is to be made up of the five Indian nations.

From the debate on the Philippine tariff bill it is easy to see why Speaker Cannon and the stand-patters so dread having the tariff question "opened." Every time it is opened, such disagreeable facts pop out! On Friday the House had some of them in full sight—the surrender of the Republican party to the Sugar Trust in the matter of the differential, its dread of allowing a fair vote on the abolition of that unnecessary and oppressive duty, the alleged bargain between the Speaker and the President to sacrifice tariff reduction for the sake of railway-rate legislation—all the long record of selfishness and inconsistency. Whenever the Democrats are given a chance, they press home these truths. The Republican complaint is that they do not accept the Philippine bill without a word. It is a measure of tariff reduction, isn't it? Certainly; and we presume the Democrats will vote for it. But it is their duty to try to amend it in order to give relief to tariff-ridden Americans as well as Filipinos. If they succeed, with the aid of some Republicans, in making the measure so just and beneficial that the Republican party managers dare not let it pass, the country will be in no doubt where to place the responsibility.

Gov. Guild's characterization, in his first message to the Massachusetts Legislature, of the Commonwealth's delegation in Congress as a "strong man demanding aggressive action of his peers" in the matter of tariff revision, loses impressiveness as the roll of her representatives is called. Lodge is for readjustment, but it must be done by the Republicans in such a careful way that "no interest shall suffer." Senator Crane does not "demand" anything, so far as the public knows. Of the eleven Republican Representatives in the House, Mr. McCall stands almost alone as a vigorous, intelligent exponent of the undoubted sentiment for revision that exists in Massachusetts. His reassignment to the Committee on Ways and Means was the only recognition by the Speaker of this supposedly aggressive demand for revision. Mr. Gillett's place on the Appropriations Committee is one of distinction, and his chairmanship of the committee on reform in the civil service is an evidence that he is a valuable man—but not necessarily in a fight for free hides. Of the other two chairmanships allotted to Massachusetts, "Son-in-law Gussie" Gardner has that on Industrial Arts and Expositions, and Mr. Lawrence that on Expenditures in the War Department. Gov. Guild will have to revise his figure of speech likening these men to the founders of Massachusetts who "set their hands to the rocks and forests," and who sang amidst the storm, "and the stars heard, and the sea."

Senator Blackburn's defeat in Kentucky will relieve the Senate of one member who can well be spared, and there are flattering rumors of Senator Gorman's coming retirement. His giving up of the minority leadership in the Senate is said to be certain. Senator Bailey has been asked to become his successor, but announces that he will not accept the post, since he has "not acquired the art of being agreeable under all circumstances." Strong convictions and a sharp tongue are, we must admit, usually regarded as a disqualification in a party manager, but without good reason, we think. John Sharp Williams can say rasping things as well as Senator Bailey, yet he has not failed as a leader on that account. Indeed, we think the Democrats in the Senate might decidedly benefit by the substitution of Mr. Bailey's intellectual and outspoken vigor for the oleaginous and secret ways of Senator Gorman. We think that Republican Senators would agree, in private at least, that there is no Democratic Senator whom they more respect—or fear—in debate than Senator Bailey. It is a queer comment on political standards that such a man should be thought not a desirable leader of his party.

The campaign for the Democratic nomination for Governor of Georgia waxes and wanes in interest as the two chief rivals, Hoke Smith of the Atlanta *Journal* and Clark Howell of the *Constitution*, discover new supplies of political ammunition. It seems to turn just now on the question, "Is it necessary to take any further action to disfranchise the negroes of Georgia in order to guarantee white domination?" The *Journal* declares that nothing else than an educational qualification will make Georgia safe. But the *Constitution* quotes Senator Money of Mississippi to prove that an educational qualification, instead of reducing the negro vote, actually increases it, in proportion to the white vote. The simple old provision inserted in the Georgia Constitution by Robert Toombs, requiring a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

voter to pay his poll tax, is, it is urged, more effective than anything else in keeping the negroes from voting. Senator Money says: "The educational test may operate to create a desire to qualify themselves on the part of a few of the ambitious negroes, but it has absolutely nothing to do with keeping the negro masses from the polls. I am sure this is true in Mississippi." Georgia is certainly "safe" in any case, and the campaign is serving to show the decreasing importance of this political bugbear.

The selection of Wadsworth as Speaker of the New York Assembly is what patrons of the prize-ring would call a bad knock-out for Odell. The boss mustered fewer votes than most people expected. True, he was opposed by the State administration; but then, only a few short months ago, he was absolute master of the machine, and he innocently looked for the support of many men who owed to him their positions as members of the Legislature and as incumbents of office under Roosevelt and under Higgins. He looked in vain. The professional politician does not spend himself on sentimental attachments; indifferent to charges of ingratitude, he turns to the rising, not the setting, sun. Odell, kicked down the Capitol steps as ostentatiously as he himself kicked Platt down them not long since, has nothing to console him but Platt's philosophy of defeat as phrased by Isaiah: "The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib." The owner seems to be Theodore Roosevelt.

Gov. Higgins's recommendations on election reform are sound so far as they go. No one but Senators Platt and Depew will be disposed to dispute his dictum that "no [business] corporation exists which includes among its lawful purposes the right to donate its moneys to influence an election. The practice is morally as well as legally wrong." In view of recent revelations we do not believe the Legislature can hesitate to adopt the Governor's recommendation: "that the making of political payments by corporations be made a penal offence, and that all officers and agents of such corporations knowing or approving thereof be subject to fine and imprisonment." Some members may offer the amendment "fine *or* imprisonment," but the "and" should stay. The Governor is not very explicit as to the direct primary and a new ballot law, but his heart is, we trust, in the right place. The most important topic of the message is insurance legislation. Here, too, the Governor deals largely in generalities; but he has the excellent excuse that courtesy compels him to wait for the report of the legislative committee. Gov. Higgins is also ready for thoroughgoing changes, though, in the effort to be judicial, he falls into the Roosevelt style of teetering: We must have a law which shall be "drastic but practicable, radical but sane," framed in a spirit which shall be "courageous but not hysterical." Specifically, he would have the State Department of Insurance more vigilant; the investments of the company more carefully safeguarded; the expenditures for salaries and the other purposes more closely scrutinized. The directors should have no conflicting business connections; the policies should be free from complexity and ambiguity; and the gains of the companies should be equitably distributed. Here is a task for men.

State Senator Brackett's resolution asking Depew to resign has thus far done nothing more than provoke acrimonious discussion. Senator Brackett himself cannot expect that the Legislature will go to the length of formally condemning Depew. That would be too ghastly a piece of hypocrisy. If our legislators test Depew's conduct by comparing it with their own, they will probably agree with Senator Malby that the versatile representative of the Vanderbilts is "one of the grand characters of this country, and one of the great characters of the civilized world." Senator Brackett complained that Depew received from the Equitable $20,000 a year for which no services were rendered. Depew can retort that various members of the Legislature enjoyed the hospitality of the Mutual Life's "House of Mirth," and received from the several insurance companies more than $20,000 a year—for all of which valuable services were rendered. A virtuous Legislature which tries to get Depew out of the United States Senate should let judgment begin with the House of God—find out what members have been in the pay of the insurance lobby, and scourge them from the consecrated halls of the Capitol. But whatever may be said for or against Depew and his critics, the Brackett resolutions fairly express the sober opinion of citizens of this State. On a popular vote these discredited statesmen would be beaten out of sight. They grossly misrepresent the intelligence and morality of New York.

After a long and costly trial, Charles Gilhooley and a fellow-slugger, together with five labor-union officials of Chicago, have been convicted of "conspiracy to do bodily injury to a workman who refused to leave his place when a strike was called." The *News* of Chicago, which cannot be accused of antagonism to "labor," declares that the verdict is just. The evidence showed that the Carriage and Wagon Workers' Union, being on strike, hired three professional bruisers, with Gilhooley as chief, to beat and cripple those workmen who stuck to their jobs. One of them, Carl Carlstrom, was terribly beaten by these roughs, and died two weeks later, pneumonia having followed the injury. The testimony did not show that the beating was the direct cause of Carlstrom's death, but conspiracy was clearly proved. It was shown that the union paid Gilhooley and his "wreckers" for their bloody work, and that it advanced money for their defence in court. The union's executive board, by formal action, agreed to pay the sluggers' wages. Yet the Carriage and Wagon Workers' Union was not in all this doing an unheard-of thing. Chicago is too familiar with this particular brand of union "control." As the *News* says, "the punishment accorded by the jury—five to ten years in the penitentiary and a $2,000 fine for Gilhooley, and one to five years' imprisonment for each of the other six—is not too severe." Notoriously, a penal lesson like this is not the peculiar need of Chicago, among all our great cities.

When a union between the National Academy and the Society of American Artists was mooted last winter, we predicted that it would not be difficult for the two nominally rival organizations to arrive at an understanding. As a matter of fact, the joint committee has recommended a plan of merger which is admirably simple. The Society of American Artists will sink itself in the older Academy on condition that the Academy extend its membership limit, give to associates as well as academicians a voice in its affairs, and enlarge and liberalize the membership of its juries. In other words, the Society will consider its work done if the Academy will give fair recognition to the actual accomplishment of members of the Society, and will adopt in principle the reforms for which the Society was founded. This may be done without any heartburnings, for the Academy, year by year, has grown more open-minded towards outsiders and less inclined to press to an extreme the prerogative of its members. Meanwhile there has been a virtual interchange of membership between the two bodies. Like Harpagon's cook-coachman, many an artist may be a member of the Academy or of the Society, according to the train of capital letters he doffs or dons. For example, at the current Academy exhibition there are some forty exhibitors who are members of both organizations. We trust that the report of the committee will be accepted on either hand. Art in America has only to gain by a movement that means greater concentration of effort on the part of the artists, and a more dignified and representative character in the public exhibitions.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR. SCHIFF'S WARNING.

Mr. Jacob H. Schiff's remarks on the money market and the currency, before the Chamber of Commerce on Thursday need to be considered very carefully in the light of the situation which called them forth. The advance in demand loans above 100 per cent. the previous week in Wall Street, and the opening of the new year with the highest rates reached at this period in a generation, were described by Mr. Schiff as "nothing less than a disgrace to a civilized community." Unless, he proceeded, the conditions which make possible such abnormal phenomena in the money market are soon changed, the time will come when "we shall get a panic in this country compared with which the three which have preceded it would only be child's play." What are the facts which justify so serious a warning?

"We all know the cause," said Mr. Schiff; "the cause is in our insufficient circulating medium, or the insufficient elasticity of our circulating medium." This inelasticity seems to Mr. Schiff to be largely, if not mainly, attributable to our Sub-Treasury system—Government money, left on deposit with the banks, added to the supplies on the open market at a time when "the national banks were gorged with their deposits." Mr. Schiff holds that this Government money ought to have been withdrawn from the banks when the market did not need it, and then to have been held in reserve in the Treasury, awaiting the hour of outside stringency. Thereupon, relief by the Government would have been practicable. But Secretary Shaw disliked to withdraw deposits, and left the larger part of them in the banks until the autumn; he was therefore not in a position to increase Treasury deposits in the December stringency. This was the drift of Mr. Schiff's review of the conditions precedent to the 100 per cent. money market. That the money stringency was caused solely by "the speculation which prosperity always brings forward," he does not believe; his reason being that "in France, in Germany, in England, speculation has been rampant at certain periods, and still you have never seen the money market for sixty days in such a condition that rates have varied all the way from 10 to 125 per cent."

Mr. Schiff's authority as an expert on the money market is unquestionably high. But agreeing as we do with his main conclusions, we find much difficulty in subscribing to his reasons. Wall Street is familiar with the "money squeeze" brought on by extensive lock-up of cash in the Treasury, at a time when demand for money on the open market is very active. Such a condition existed in 1899, when, in the face of a narrowing New York bank reserve, the Treasury's surplus revenue ran to $23,000,000 in three months. It was a real cause of the disordered autumn markets in 1887 and 1888, and in other years of excessive public revenue.

It has not been, however, a cause of this autumn's stringency. There have been "surplus months" and "deficit months" since the fiscal year began on July 1, but the net result has been that the Treasury has paid out $7,300,000 to the money market. Furthermore, the Treasury did call in a good part of its bank deposits during the period of easy money. Between the first of last January and the end of August, it reduced them $47,000,000; it did so, not because the market did not need this money, but because the Treasury did; its revenue deficit having amounted to $41,000,000 in the fiscal year 1904 and to $23,000,000 in 1903. Granting that the machinery for the shifting of these funds is clumsy and awkward, we are nevertheless unable to understand how the recent extraordinary money stringency can be ascribed to it.

We believe the cause of that stringency to be so plain, and to be so intertwined with practices dangerous to our financial future, that our chief feeling about Mr. Schiff's address is one of regret that he should wholly have failed to point it out. We refer to the use of bank credit in the high Stock Exchange speculation of the past four months. It is true that Europe has witnessed stock speculation without seeing also 50 or 100 per cent. call money; Germany has had an experience of the sort this season, though we believe that 7 or 8 per cent. on the Berlin Stock Exchange was the worst of the money stringency. But the speculations indulged in in those markets are, in our judgment, trifling affairs beside what has lately been presented to the view of Wall Street.

We have had a market admitting that one $70,000,000 stock, another of $50,000,000, and a third of $30,000,000 were virtually cornered; their prices were then advanced, after the opening of September, by the speculators in control of them, thirty, forty-seven, and one hundred and seventy points respectively. These operations, and numerous similar ventures which accompanied them, were undertaken at a time when the legitimate demands of trade and industry were at the very highest. It is notorious that these speculating millionaires and their following were provided by our banks with money which had been largely obtained from deposits made by Western institutions in this city, and which were certain to be recalled when the active harvest trade set in. Whether loaned for such purposes on call or on time, no intelligent man in Wall Street doubts for an instant that these huge advances, for pure stock-jobbing operations, so far tied up available resources of our banks that they came into December wholly unable properly to meet the situation. The extent to which, even then, with 25 per cent. money and bank reserves below the legal minimum, great lending institutions continue to provide the fuel for continued speculation, leaves the money convulsion at the end of the year, in our opinion, a phenomenon which the simplest mind can understand.

We wholly fail to find, with Mr. Schiff, a primal cause for it in the Treasury operations or in the rigidity of our banknote currency. In both directions there are constant possibilities of danger and urgent need of reform, but we must look elsewhere for the causes of this autumn's episode. We agree with Mr. Schiff that it has been a disgrace to a civilized community. We consider it such, however, because, after years of talk about the growing intelligence and conservatism of New York finance, and with the instance before their eyes of a great European bank which publicly warned its own market's stock-exchange speculators that it was prepared to obstruct their ill-timed ventures until the money strain was over, our own institutions, with some honorable exceptions, have simply gone with the Stock Exchange. Again agreeing with Mr. Schiff, though on different grounds, we suspect that some day a very serious lesson will be taught to our stock-jobbing financiers and their bank supporters, unless they abandon their recent practices. And the banks ought by this time to be aware that the distrust of motives and purposes inspired in the public mind by such events as we have seen, is the main barrier to any intelligent revision of the bank circulation system.

THE AUTOMATIC TARIFF BRAKE.

For a revelation of the pure essence of contemporary tariff doctrine nothing could possibly serve better than the discussion now going on relative to the duty on works of art. This schedule is only a small revenue producer—the firecracker duty contributed almost as much last year at the Custom House. Art is not an historic subject of taxation. Finally, the members of the class supposedly protected, namely, the American artists, are practically a unit for the repeal of this tariff. The protectionist is as much at a loss for arguments to defend the provision on its merits as is the free-trader himself.

For all this, it is practically certain that Section 454, like all the others, will remain unaltered during the life of the present Congress. Why is this? Why must a barbarous enactment remain on the statute-book when it has hardly a single open advocate and its very beneficiaries are loud in denouncing it? The answer is, that the contribution of the present period to the traditions of the tariff has been a set of new principles which, taken together, not only form an effectual brake on all reformatory legis-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lation, but even relieve the tariff custodians of the annoyance of having to defend by argument the particular provisions which may be under attack. There has been devised a series of reasons for inaction which have nothing whatever to do with the protective principle or any other economic consideration, and which could be used as effectively to defend the worst as the best tariff law ever framed.

Chief of these is the proposition that, if one schedule is touched, all must be overhauled. This is not altogether new, of course, but it has never been used with such assurance and such sweeping application as in the present era of Dingleyism. Let foreign pictures in free, and what will become of the tin-plate manufacturer? Put hides on the free-list, and who will provide for the steel-rail manufacturer? Bring Canadian lumber to our mills, and how can the cutlery-maker keep from putting up his shutters? This is an argument that, if made at all, no one respected until the last quarter of our national history. It was once an extremely common event for Congress to pass an act altering one or several schedules, without this action precipitating a general revision. Between 1794 and 1816, according to Mr. Stanwood's 'American Tariff Controversies in the Nineteenth Century,' twenty-four acts modifying the tariff were passed. Thus, the sugar and tea schedules were taken up by themselves in 1795; molasses, velvets, and muslins, and some other articles, in 1797; salt later in the same year; fish, fruits, spices, window glass, cigars, and one or two other articles in 1804; old copper, saltpetre, and sulphur in 1805, and so on. The famous woollens bill of 1827, which failed to pass the Senate, got full consideration from the House without dragging in all other interests concerned with the tariff. The rate on manufactured iron was changed in 1830 to equal that of bar iron, and in the same year—not by the same bill—alterations were made in coffee, salt, molasses, and tea. Leaving out of account the war-time changes in duties, there remains as a conspicuous instance the Wool and Woollens act of 1867, raising the duties in one schedule, passed by a Congress which refused to make a general revision. These are but a few capital cases illustrative of the sort of changes which used to be possible, in response to just such demands as are being made to-day for modification of specific duties.

Of course, log-rolling methods have been perfected in the last forty years, the interdependence of industries is closer and their means for exerting pressure at Washington in some respects stronger. Still, there is abundant evidence to show that there is no immutable and fundamental law of nature to the effect that whosoever alters one tariff provision must straightway alter all.

Next in importance to the principle thus described is what may be called the law of alternate objections. Blessed be the memory of the fathers who decreed that the long rather than the short session of Congress should come just before the biennial elections. No one can tell how much trouble it has saved. Congress cannot be expected to revise the tariff just before election. At the short session, although that consideration no longer acts as a deterrent, there is not time to put through a bill, much as the lawmakers would like to. Obviously, these two arguments can be alternated from now till doomsday and never lose their freshness.

This excuse of "no time" uttered so often by poor harassed Congressmen, footsore with tramping over Washington in quest of fourth-class postmasterships and invalid pensions, has itself, by the way, some interesting aspects. "Of course, it must take long deliberation to pass important legislation," exclaims the sympathetic bystander. Yet how long does it really take the House of Representatives as now controlled to dispose of such momentous affairs as it is allowed to consider at all? The Esch-Townsend bill was certainly the most important and most conspicuous measure before the Fifty-eighth Congress. Yet it was taken up on a Monday a little after noon and passed on the following Thursday at 3 P. M. The Philippine Improvement bill received the undivided attention of the House from noon one day until 1 P. M. on the next.

The Dingley law, it must be remembered, has already remained in force for a longer period than any previous act since the Walker tariff, the term of which it will equal on February 28, 1908. But the day has long passed when the way of replying to an assault on any given schedule was an attempt to prove that the clause itself was valuable.

THE CHINESE BOYCOTT.

John W. Foster, ex-Secretary of State, is not among those who believe that the Chinese boycott is merely a temporary affair. Some of our consuls, eager to give the State Department the news it most desires, may take that view, but Mr. Foster, in his notable article in the current *Atlantic Monthly*, declares flatly that if our "present legislation is continued in force, the boycott of American goods in China will not only continue, but will grow in extent and vigor." And he adds significantly, "The danger is that it will not only affect our commerce, but extend to all other American interests." This he explains by pointing out that China need only apply to American citizens within her territory the same laws and regulations that are now applied in the United States to Chinese subjects. By this means, and without proscription or persecution, all American enterprise in China can be brought to a halt.

This relates not merely to missionary endeavor, but to business undertakings as well. The basis for the original treaty of 1868 between China and the United States was "a spirit of reciprocal and sincere friendship, and with entire justice." Since justice in this country has meant the exclusion of all Chinese bankers, capitalists, contractors, builders, engineers, mining experts and operatives, manufacturers, machinists, missionaries and physicians, justice and reciprocity in China would mean the exclusion of precisely the same classes, with the practical cessation of trade and effort along those lines. It would not quite mean the closing of the open door to Americans, but something perilously near to it. Moreover, it could not be resented in any way except by the application of brute force. We might bombard Chinese towns and again land troops in China; but with what decency, if we were demanding of China for our people privileges we denied to her own? Moreover, the time is passing when China can be overawed by a handful of ships. The extraordinary revolution in national sentiment and in methods of government now going on under our own eyes is creating a new China, even as a new Japan has arisen overnight. It is something to be devoutly welcomed; the time cannot come too soon when China will be able to put an end to such thefts of her territory as have disgraced Germany, France, and England.

But meanwhile the public may ask, Why is China so particularly embittered against the United States, which has never filched any of her territory? The answer is in Mr. Foster's article. It is because the United States as a nation has repeatedly broken its word to China; because Chinese citizens have been treated, not like human beings, but like brutes, and this not only at our custom houses, but within our cities and States. We welcomed them by thousands after the treaty of 1868; Secretary Fish officially stated that the increase in emigration was desired by our people. Eagerly our railroad builders seized upon Chinese to construct the railways which opened up the great West. Even as late as 1883 there were 15,000 Chinamen at work on the Northern Pacific, and but for their industry that railroad could never have been completed in time to save its all-necessary land grant. Before that, however, the demagogues and labor unions of California had begun to assert themselves. Not content with mobbing and killing Chinamen where they found them, they first tyrannized the California Legislature, and then marched

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on Washington. The "wise discretion," "sincere friendship," and "entire justice" so readily promised were quite forgotten; treaty promises were ignored, particularly by executive officers. As a matter of fact, the immigration officials have repeatedly assumed that Chinese had no right to trial by jury, to "due process of law for the protection of their lives and property." In the case of the United States against Ju Toy, decided last May, Justice Brewer of the Supreme Court commented scathingly on the Immigration Bureau's Star Chamber methods and their denial of witnesses, counsel, and jury to Chinamen who were solemnly promised the same rights as those given to American citizens.

Mr. Foster could have filled his entire article with individual cases of the savage ill-treatment of Chinese. He speaks of only two. The first was the suicide of the Chinese military attaché, Tom Kim Yung, after his shocking abuse at the hands of the San Francisco police, for which outrage nobody was punished. The thousands of countrymen who followed him to the grave regarded themselves, Mr. Foster says, as personally outraged by the wrongs done him; it is easy to conceive what their letters home must have contained. To the lawless raid upon the decent Chinamen of Boston by immigration officers in 1902, Mr. Foster gives much space. As our readers must be familiar with this disgraceful occurrence—for which no official has ever been punished or reprimanded—we would merely remind them that hundreds of innocent Chinamen were arrested without warrants. Merchants and laborers alike were thrown into wagons; 250 were crowded into two small rooms in the Federal Building, where there was only standing space, and compelled to remain there in some cases for twenty hours—guilty of no crime or wrongdoing, and tortured thus merely that the authorities might run down a few who had sneaked in from Canada in violation of law. Had this happened to American merchants in Shanghai, all America would have been demanding revenge at the point of the sword. How great a part this outrage had in precipitating the anti-American boycott cannot be estimated. It is a fact that the details were spread all over China officially and unofficially.

There is but one remedy and one hope, as Mr. Foster points out: absolute justice on the part of Americans, which includes the enactment of a fair treaty. President Roosevelt has taken this stand, and has already ameliorated the harsh enforcement of the immigration laws. But whether the Government as a whole is to reassert itself, whether Congress will decline at last to abdicate its functions at the behest of labor unions, remains to be seen. The financial loss to the pockets of our merchants and traders will at least show them that justice in this case spells dollars and cents.

NEW PHASES OF PRIMARY REFORM.

The balanced utterances of Gov. Higgins on the subject of primary-election reform are not likely to satisfy those who have created the "growing sentiment" which he reports in this State in favor of direct nominations. "The new method as at present developed," he says, "has grave faults as well as attractive features, and a careful consideration of the effect of primary laws of other States should precede any attempt to model legislation thereon." The fact is that, in this period of boss-smashing, orators and campaigners have been calling for the "direct primary" as if that expression signified a hard-and-fast, definitely worked-out system, like capital punishment or the Torrens plan of land titles, instead of an idea that is still in the experimental stage.

If the abolition of conventions were the only thing to be desired, there would be no need of going to the Legislature at all, at least so far as local nominations are concerned. New York already has the direct primary in optional form, the Legislature of 1900 having enacted that—

> "In case the general committee representing a party in any city or village to which this act is applicable, or in a county wholly within any such city, or in a borough of any such city, shall adopt, by a majority vote, a rule that the nomination of that party's candidates, for specified public offices to be filled wholly from such subdivision, shall be made at the primary elections of the party, then, so long as such rule remains in force, the nomination of that party's candidates, for the public offices specified in such rule, shall be made by the enrolled members of the party at the official primary elections of the party held on the annual primary day."

It is under this provision that the Direct Nominations League, of which Gen. McAlpin is president, is proceeding with its petitions to our county and city committees for a trial of the new plan.

The experience of other States has taught that the details of a direct primary law are considerably more important than was at first supposed. The first point to receive attention generally was the fair and accurate separation of Democrats from Republicans. The party enrolment a year in advance, as required by the existing primary law of this State, provides already one of the most successful means to this end. The requirement of a public declaration of party allegiance at the voting place on primary day has proved less satisfactory in a number of ways. Yet the simple stipulation that a voter who participates in the nomination of one candidate of a given party must not join in any other party's nominations for other offices, is regarded as a sufficient safeguard in some of the States with most carefully drawn primary laws.

Still, even after the packing of one party's caucus by members of the other is guarded against, there remains the question of the method of nomination. Conventions are governed by either majority or two-thirds rules; none of them permits a minority to select the candidate. Manifestly, if the direct system accomplishes its object of bringing out many candidates for important offices, the chance of any one getting a full half of the votes is diminished by that very fact. Should nominations by a mere plurality be permitted under the direct primary? The makers of the last such law passed, that of Illinois, evidently thought not, for they provided that when no candidate in the primary has a majority of votes, the result shall not govern, and a convention is to be held instead. It is out of this objection that the second-choice scheme has developed. A bill which was introduced in the Legislature of 1903 in this State by Mr. McClelland was in its main features similar to the ill-fated "Mary Ann" bill which Gov. La Follette tried to put through the special session of the Wisconsin Legislature just before his resignation.

The idea is that every voter in the primary is to record a second as well as a first choice for the nomination to each office. If any aspirant has a majority of "first-choice" votes, he is, of course, nominated. If no candidate has such a majority, however, the one with the smallest "first-choice" vote is to be dropped from the canvass, and the "second-choice" votes of his supporters added to the "first-choice" votes of the other candidates. The "second-choice" votes of candidates at the bottom are thus added in until some candidate does secure a majority over the others.

This is an untried plan. If three or four candidates are deadlocked in a convention or legislature, the choice is likely to fall on some absolutely unthought-of man proposed as a compromise. Under this plan the resultant candidate should be the contestant who is best able to retain the good will of his opponents. This is not a principle from which any one can well dissent, but the success of the project in practice remains a trifle problematical. Also untried is the Wisconsin plan of convening the State and legislative candidates each year to draw up and pass the party platform.

It has been one of the singular features of primary reform that novel provisions have been so generally copied before they have been tested. There were jeers only a few years ago at the notion of nominating United States Senators by popular primary. As a matter of fact, it has not yet been done in a Northern State; still, every primary law passed in the last three years contains this feature. There is accumulating a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mass of data which our Legislature can study; and when others are so willing to attempt the experimenting, there is certainly no reason for ill-considered legislation in this State.

THE PRINTERS' STRIKE.

The decision of the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court, on January 2, declaring unconstitutional and void a law restricting the freedom of contract in the employment of labor, falls pat with the strike in the printing trade which began with the first of the year. This is distinctly a strike for the closed shop. That means, of course, a labor monopoly. The Typographical Union would make it impossible for any workmen outside their organization to obtain employment. It would compel all publishers and printers and newspapers to hire only members of the union. Yet it is precisely this spirit of exclusion and tyranny which the Court has just decided to be repugnant to our institutions and laws, and its translation into action violative of the Constitution of New York.

The law in question was one passed in 1887, under the general head of "Coercion by Employers," which forbade the making of an agreement not to belong to a labor union the condition precedent of employment. Such a statute, the Justices of the Appellate Division now declare, was beyond the competence of the Legislature. The Court denies the power of the Legislature to "compel employers, under penalty of fine and imprisonment, to employ union men only." The freedom of contract implies the right of every man "to employ whomsoever he pleases, . . . unless, of course, he makes a contract contrary to public policy." It is alleged, to be sure, that any kind of impairment of the privileges or pretensions of labor unions will lead to unrest and disturbance of the public peace; but the Judges neatly dispose of this by remarking: "We recollect no instance in which it has been held that it is competent for a Legislature to restrict one's constitutional rights upon the theory that, if he be permitted to exercise the same, others will become incensed thereby and violate the law and be guilty of a breach of the peace or create public disorder."

Other questions are involved in the printers' strike, but they are subordinate. One of the demands is for nine hours' pay for eight hours' work. That is a matter fairly to be tried out between the union and the employers. It is mainly a question whether the trade will bear such an increase of wages. That a higher cost of production would be involved, is agreed on all hands. The Typographical Union admits that the eight hours' day would mean an increase in cost of 15 per cent. The Typothetæ figure it at 23 per cent. In either case, the question is whether the added cost can be passed on to the consumer—that "forgotten man" whom the labor monopolists regard, equally with the tariff monopolists, as a stupid and patient beast of burden, who will stagger along under any load piled upon his back. But, as we say, this dispute about more wages is one that is to be decided by an actual test of the labor market. The employing printers aver, first, that they cannot afford to pay the higher rates, since they are necessarily exposed to out-of-town competition; and, second, that they can obtain, with adequate police protection, all the skilled labor they need at existing prices. That is to be determined by experiment. The union is within its rights in demanding higher wages; the employers in demanding that men willing and anxious to work at the rate now paid be allowed to do so. This is elementary.

But behind the money question lies one of vital principle. The union strikes for the closed shop. The employers are fighting for the open shop; which simply means that they are fighting for the right to own and control their own property. Under union dictation, the owner of a printing-office cannot put his own son to work at the machinery in his own composing-room; cannot hire or discharge his own employees; cannot control even his own foreman; and has to submit to every kind of petty tyranny and restriction of output. How these impositions strike a self-respecting American employer may be seen in the plain-spoken circular addressed to the compositors of the Hill Publishing Company by its president. He himself has risen from the ranks—is still an honorary member, he states, of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers—and feels strongly about the closed shop, or any other union device which tends to "grade the workmen down, not up." We quote a few of his homely words of refreshing sense and candor:

> "I shall be sorry to see a man go away—especially those who have been with us from the start. I do not believe that you can get better jobs or a more appreciative 'old man.' But this 'old man' cannot stand everything. The savings of a life of hard work are in this concern, and all the fun he can get out of it is to run it his own way, with due regard for the rights of others. He always has worked more than eight hours a day, and always expects to.
>
> "If the officers of a labor union run this concern, some one else will own it—I won't.
>
> "Hereafter the foreman works for the owners, and not for the union.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> "Now, the whole thing simmers down to about this:
>
> "You say to us—Shut down this plant another hour per day, pay the same wages that you do now, and place the conduct of the shop in the hands of our union and walking delegate, or we strike.
>
> "We say to you—We insist on our right to run our own concern nine hours per day, run an open shop, and employ whom we please. If that is the issue, go ahead—we will fight."

Few not directly affected are aware of the overweening pretensions and intolerable exactions of the Typographical Union. It aspires to be supreme over both Church and State. Here is an extract from the oath which its members are required to take: "*That my fidelity to the union and my duty to the members thereof shall in no sense be interfered with by any allegiance that I may now or hereafter owe to any other organization, social, political, or religious, secret or otherwise.*" It is not strange that a Catholic priest should have read this oath to his congregation and announced that no person subscribing to it could, in his parish, share in the sacraments of the Church. And every newspaper in whose office the tyranny of the Typographical Union is set up, could testify to the way in which it follows up its assumption of divine right by attempting to enforce the most absolutist claims. Not simply does it claim to dictate in regard to wages, apprentices, machinery, output, etc., but it is rapidly extending its sway over other departments, so that in some instances the proprietors cannot discharge a reporter or hire a skilled proof-reader or dispense with the services of a dramatic critic without first consulting the magnates of the Union. This is one reason why the press of the country should take a deep interest in this strike of the Typographical Union. It is a contest between freedom and tyranny in the whole printing trade. If the open shop wins, there will be gains for liberty all round. The newspapers that are union-ridden may hope to strike off some of their galling shackles. But if the closed shop triumphs, the next thing will be the closed mouth; for it may not be long before the Typographical Union, once able to say in what way opinions shall be printed, will arrogate to itself the right to decide what opinions it will allow to be printed at all.

THE PAY OF MUSICIANS.

The strike of the chorus singers at the Metropolitan Opera House has called attention, among other things, to the wide disparity between the earnings of those at the bottom of the operatic ladder and those on the top rung. A year or so ago Mme. Emma Calvé made a public protest against the inadequacy of the remuneration received by chorus singers in grand opera; yet, so far as known, she did not offer to have part of the demanded extra payment deducted from the $2,000 she received for every performance in which she appeared. Mr. Conried, no doubt, would be happy to pare the highest salaries on his list for the benefit of the lowest, but he naturally hesitates to add to his managerial expenses $1,000 a week. That increase, in an uncertain season, might wipe out all profits, and more.

He had certainly a grievance in this

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

case. The singers had, of their own free will, individually signed contracts to perform specified duties for a certain number of weeks. They wantonly broke their contract—a proceeding for which employees ought to be liable to some punishment as well as employers—and they aggravated the offence by doing their best to destroy one of the gala events of the season and mar the pleasure of nearly four thousand persons who had nothing whatever to do with their quarrel. But this is the usual union method. The audience was keenly alive to the situation, and when Mr. Conried came forward and announced that he had "firmly and absolutely refused to be dictated to by the chorus as a labor union," there was an outburst of applause such as usually follows only the song of some favorite tenor or prima donna. The public was overwhelmingly with the manager.

Before the chorus took its altogether indefensible step, Mr. Conried had signified his willingness to meet it halfway on the salary question and other points in dispute. After the total disregard of the artistic side of the question shown by the chorus singers on strike, he might question their right to be considered artists. Yet he could hardly fail to see the justice of granting them at least as much as the chorus girls get in the theatres where operettas and musical farces are performed, which is $18 a week. Even that is little enough, considering the hard work to be done; yet the supply far exceeds the demand. When Mr. Savage advertised for a flower-girl chorus for his production of "Parsifal" in England, more than a thousand young women applied.

The incident at the Metropolitan will, no doubt, lead to considerable discussion of the general question whether music pays as a profession, and whether the thousands of girls who yearly flock to New York from all parts of the country had not better stay at home, help their mothers, and get married, following the advice of Hans von Bülow. The vast majority of those who prepare themselves for a career as opera singers or concert-givers end by becoming teachers very soon after their first appearances in public. After having had a training costing years of hard work and thousands of dollars, they find that it is extremely difficult to get a chance for an appearance at an entertainment which the public and the critics are sure to attend. Managers and conductors are beseiged by young musicians, most of them mediocrities, who jostle the better ones and crowd them out by sheer numbers. Most of these are glad to play or sing for nothing for the mere chance of appearing in public; some of them even pay for the privilege of showing off their accomplishments at Sunday concerts or others.

After all, the profession of teaching, to which most of the students of music are condemned, may be a source of as much happiness and emolument as a stage career, with its many worries, uncertainties, and disappointments. There are teachers of the piano or the voice in this country who earn $10,000 or more a year, and command as much respect in the community as any pianist or singer. Many earn half that sum. The rank and file, to be sure, work for much less; but that is the case in all the professions. If we may accept the estimate of a writer in *Harper's Weekly*, "the average earnings of qualified and certified doctors of medicine in the United States do not exceed $600 a year"; that is, the average American physician earns only $300 more in a year than Mr. Conried's chorus singers do in five months; and he has had a much more expensive education. As regards teachers in public schools, it has been found that, in a list including 467 American cities, there were 53,554 positions with annual salaries of $600 and over, besides 14,193 of $500 to $600, and 17,728 annual salaries below $500. Commenting on these figures, Commissioner W. T. Harris has remarked that "no teacher has a right to complain, on a socialistic basis, if he is receiving a salary for his annual services of $600." From this point of view, music pays probably as well, on the average, as most vocations.

Every chorus singer has a chance to become a Sembrich, an Eames, or a Nordica, a Caruso or a Knote. The rewards of success in music are, indeed, so great that it is a wonder that so few men compete for them. In some departments women have things almost entirely their own way; yet a prominent woman teacher complained, not long ago, that musical students of both sexes seemed more and more inclined to go to men for lessons. In London, the members of the orchestras used to be largely Germans; now, the German-visiting conductors have to address them in English, which shows that the prejudice that so long kept men out of music is passing away. In view of the fortunes won by such artists as Paderewski, Jean de Reszke, Tamagno, Johann and Richard Strauss, Arthur Sullivan, and Victor Herbert, American men may well ask themselves whether music does not pay better than they had supposed.

THE MOROCCO CONFERENCE.

To judge merely by the published *agenda* of the forthcoming Morocco Conference, there is no occasion whatever for the nervousness, amounting almost to apprehension, with which it is regarded in Europe. Wars and rumors of war fill the air. It is a "critical situation," declares the London *Times*, and adds: "Is this the moment when British statesmen, philanthropists, and chambers of commerce seriously believe they serve the cause of peace by falling on the necks of our German cousins and embracing them?" This is obviously a fling at Campbell-Bannerman's announced policy of seeking the friendliest relations with Germany; and, for the rest, is in keeping with the rôle of international stabber which the *Times* seems lately to have taken up. But it cannot be denied that many who do not, like it, prostrate themselves at the altar of the great god Jingo every day, yet feel that a great international peril, if not a threat of war, lurks in the conference called to deal with Moroccan affairs.

Its official programme, however, is the most peaceful-looking document imaginable. From the text of the agreement signed by France and Germany on September 28, we learn that the Conference on Moroccan affairs is to discuss the organization of the police; the repression of contraband trade, particularly in arms; financial reforms; and finally the "establishment of principles calculated to safeguard economic liberty." Certain rights of France to police the frontier are reserved, as are also certain commitments of German bankers as respects loans for public improvements in Morocco. Here, certainly, is no appearance of fighting matter.

It is really, of course, in jealousies and collisions extraneous to the Conference proper that the danger lies. In May and June last, the tension between Germany and France was undeniably acute. Even since the *accord* was signed in September, many clouds have risen upon the horizon. Military preparations have quietly been made on both sides of the Franco-German frontier. The press of either country has been suspicious and provocative. Public statements of an official character, in both Berlin and Paris, have not been wholly reassuring. On December 14 the French Government published a "Yellow Book" on the Morocco question, covering the diplomatic correspondence from 1901. It revealed a steadily heightened difference, culminating in the resignation of the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, M. Delcassé, with the solemn warning of Chancellor von Bülow to France "not to delay in a path lined with precipices and even abysses." The most directly damaging part of the correspondence, as published, affected the activities of Count Tattenbach, the German agent at Tangier, who appears to be proved guilty of double-dealing and deception. It is stated, however, that the documents about to be published by the German Government will exculpate the accused Count; so it is but fair to suspend judgment in his case. Also, it should be noted, Germany is submitting some important documents to the French Government confidentially.

If our information is not at fault, another confidential communication was

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

made by the German Government two or three years ago, not only to France, but to all the European chancelleries, which has a highly important bearing upon the whole controversy. This was an official notification that, when the affairs of Morocco came to be settled, Germany expected to be consulted. If this be true, and we have the best of reasons for so believing it, the "interference" of the German Emperor last spring wears an entirely new aspect. M. Delcassé's diplomacy seemed distinctly aimed at isolating Germany. The *entente* which he negotiated with England was, in the main, a skilful and useful agreement, but one clause of it stipulated that France, so far as England was concerned, might have a free hand in Morocco. Circumstances being what they were, this could be taken only as an affront to Germany. Her protest in advance had been coolly disregarded by M. Delcassé. Her interests in Morocco, as well as her rights as one of the signatories of the Madrid treaty relating to Morocco, she saw ignored—or, at any rate, in the way of being ignored. Human nature being what it is, and German pride what we know it, nothing was to have been expected but such a demonstration as the Kaiser made in his trip to Tangier, or such a dead-set as German diplomacy made at M. Delcassé. The result was that he had to leave office, in spite of his great services and high prestige, amid a feeling on the part of the soberest men in France, including the Prime Minister and most of the Cabinet, that he had made a grave blunder.

Such things rankle in the public mind, however; and it is the persistence of the bitterness which the Delcassé incident evoked which accounts, we believe, for most of the disquietude. But we cannot think it justified. Neither France nor Germany desires a war which would be as causeless, and probably as fruitless, as it would be terrible. In themselves, the questions to come before the Conference are not so insoluble as to cause despondency over the outlook. What the United States is doing in that Moroccan galley is a source of wonder to some. The fantastic explanation from Washington, that our historic bombardments of the Barbary pirates entitle us to a place in the Conference, can hardly be received with gravity by European diplomats, however good their control of their facial muscles. They will, we presume, attribute President Roosevelt's dispatch of envoys to his feeling that, having helped arrange the Conference, he should help give it dignity; and also to his ardent desire to sustain freedom of trade—abroad.

JOHN BARTLETT.

In every university town such as Cambridge, Mass., there is an outside circle, beyond the institution itself, of cultivated men who may or may not hold its degrees, but who contribute to the intellectual atmosphere. One of the most widely known and generally useful of these at Cambridge—whether in his active youth or in the patient and lonely seclusion of his later years—was John Bartlett, best known as the author of the dictionary entitled 'Familiar Quotations.'

He was born in Plymouth, June 14, 1820, was educated in the public schools of that town, and in 1836 entered the bookbinding establishment connected with the University bookstore in Cambridge, under John Owen, who was Longfellow's first publisher. In the next year Bartlett became a clerk in the bookstore, and soon showed remarkable talent for the business. In 1846 Mr. Owen failed, and Bartlett remained with his successor, George Nichols, but became himself the proprietor in 1849. He had shown himself in this position an uncommonly good publisher and adviser of authors. He had there published three editions of his 'Familiar Quotations,' gradually enlarging the book from the beginning. In 1859 he sold out to Sever & Francis. In 1862 he served as volunteer naval paymaster for nine months with Capt. Boutelle, his brother-in-law, on board Admiral DuPont's dispatch-boat. In August, 1863, he entered the publishing house of Little, Brown & Co., nominally as clerk, but with the promise that in eighteen months, when the existing partnership would end, he should be taken into the firm, which accordingly took place in 1865. The fourth edition of his 'Familiar Quotations,' always growing larger, had meanwhile been published by them, as well as an *édition de luxe* of Walton's 'Complete Angler,' in the preparation of which he made an especial and exceptionally fine collection of works on angling, which he afterwards presented to the Harvard College Library. His activity in the Waltonian sport is also commemorated in Lowell's poem, "To Mr. John Bartlett, who had sent me a seven-pound trout." He gave to the Library at the same time another collection of books containing "Proverbs," and still another on "Emblems."

After his becoming partner in the firm, the literary, manufacturing, and advertising departments were assigned to him, and were retained until he withdrew altogether. The fifth and sixth editions of his 'Quotations' were published by Little, Brown & Co., the seventh and eighth by Routledge of London, the ninth by Little, Brown & Co. and Macmillan & Co. of London, jointly; and of all these editions between two and three hundred thousand copies must have been sold. Of the seventh and eighth editions, as the author himself tells us, forty thousand copies were printed apart from the English reprint. The ninth edition, published in 1891, had three hundred and fifty pages more than its predecessor, and the index was increased by more than ten thousand lines. In 1881 Mr. Bartlett published his Shakspere 'Phrase-Book,' and in February, 1889, he retired from his firm to complete his indispensable Shakspere "Concordance,' which Macmillan & Co. published at their own risk in London in 1894.

All this immense literary work had the direct support and coöperation of Mr. Bartlett's wife, who was the daughter of Sidney Willard, professor of Hebrew in Harvard University, and grand-daughter of Joseph Willard, president of Harvard from 1781 to 1804. She inherited from such an ancestry the love of studious labor; and, as they had no children, she and her husband could pursue it with the greatest regularity. Both of them had, also, been great readers for many years, and there is still extant a manuscript book of John Bartlett's which surpasses most books to be found in these days, for it contains the lifelong record of his reading. What man or woman, now living, for instance, can claim to have read Gibbon's 'Decline and Fall' faithfully through, four times, from beginning to end? We must, however, remember that this was accomplished by one who began by reading a verse of the Bible aloud to his mother when he was but three years old, and had gone through the whole of it at nine.

There came, however, an event in Bartlett's life which put an end to all direct labors, when his wife and co-worker began to lose her mental clearness, and all this joint task had presently to be laid aside. For a time, he tried to continue his work unaided; and she, with unwearied patience and gentleness, would sit quietly beside him without interference. But the malady increased until she passed into that melancholy condition described so powerfully by his neighbor and intimate friend, James Russell Lowell—though drawing from a different example—in his poem of "The Darkened Mind." While Bartlett still continued his habit of reading, the writing had to be surrendered. His eyesight being ere long affected, the reading also was abandoned, and after his wife's death he lived for a year or two one of the loneliest of lives. He grew physically lame, and could scarcely cross the room unaided. A nervous trouble in the head left him able to employ a reader less and less frequently, and finally not at all. In a large and homelike room containing one of the most charming private libraries in Cambridge—the books being beautifully bound and lighting up the walls instead of darkening them—he spent most of the day reclining on the sofa, externally unemployed, simply because employment was impossible. He had occasional visitors, and four of his old friends formed what they called a "Bartlett Club" and met at his house one evening in every week. Sometimes days passed, however, without his receiving a visitor, he living alone in a room once gay with the whist parties which he and Lowell had formerly organized and carried on.

His cheerful courage, however, was absolutely unbroken, and he met every casual guest with a look of sunshine. His voice and manner, always animated and cheerful, remained almost the same. He had an inexhaustible store of anecdotes and reminiscence, and could fill the hour with talk without showing exhaustion. Seldom going out of the house, unable to take more than very short drives, he dwelt absolutely in the past, remembered the ways and deeds of all Cambridge and Boston literary men, spoke genially of all and with malice of none. He had an endless fund of good stories of personal experience. Were one to speak to him, for instance, of Edward Everett, well known for the elaboration with which he prepared his addresses, Bartlett would instantly recall how Everett once came into

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his bookstore in search of a small pocket Bible, to be produced dramatically before a rural audience at a proper time in a lecture; but, this case finding none small enough, chose a copy of Hoyle's "Games" to be produced instead, at the important moment. Then he would describe the same Edward Everett whom he once called upon and found busy in drilling a few Revolutionary soldiers who were to be on the platform during Everett's famous Concord oration, and whom he drilled first to stand up and be admired at a certain point in the oration, and then to sit down again, by signal, that the audience might rather rise in their honor. Unfortunately, one man, who was totally deaf, forgot the instruction and absolutely refused to sit down, because "the squire" had told him to stand up. In a similar way, Bartlett's unimpaired memory held the whole circle of eminent men among whom he had grown up from youth, and a casual visitor might infer from his cheery manner that these comrades had just left the room. During his last illness, mind and memory seemed equally unclouded until the very end, and almost the last words he spoke were a caution to his faithful nurse not to forget to pay the small sum due to a man who had been at work on his driveway, he naming the precise sum due in dollars and cents.

He died on the morning of December 3, 1905, aged eighty-five. Was his career, after all, more to be pitied or envied? He lived a life of prolonged and happy labor among the very choicest gems of human thought; and died with patient fortitude, after all visible human joys had long been laid aside.

JOINT MEETINGS OF HUMANISTS AT ITHACA.

ITHACA, N. Y., December 30, 1905.

The attendance at the joint meetings at Cornell University, on December 26-29, of the Archæological Institute of America, the American Philological Association, and the American Anthropological Association was larger than at any like meeting since the first American Congress of Philologists, which was devoted to the memory of the late Professor Whitney, and was held in Philadelphia in December, 1894. The temporary union of the three organizations was natural and convenient, since most of the classical archæologists are members of the Philological Association, and the most prominent anthropologists are members also of the Archæological Institute. It is understood that the three bodies will meet together again next year, in Washington, in the Christmas holidays.

The arrangements for the recent meeting were satisfactory in every way. In bad weather the distance of the hotels from the halls of meeting might have been disagreeable, but, with the exception of a single evening, the skies were bright and the air mild. The University was most hospitable. Its buildings were thrown open for the meetings of the associations, and the visitors were invited to luncheon each day in Sage College. Ex-President White, in a charming address of greeting, took occasion to correct a more or less prevalent belief in the early hostility of Cornell University and State universities generally to humanistic studies. President Schurmann not only offered a formal welcome, in eloquent and thoughtful words emphasizing the worth of the studies of humanity which the associations represented, but also gave at his own house a reception which, with the luncheons at Sage College, supplied the opportunity for the social element which is always important in such gatherings. A "smoker" at the Town and Gown Club served for a still more informal meeting of the men. The programmes had been arranged so skilfully that the speakers were not hurried, and time was allowed for discussion. That no one could be present in two meetings at the same moment, had to be accepted as the result of a physical law, though often regretted.

More papers than usual were notable as being more than merely learned and scholarly. One of the most interesting was on the East Front of the Erechtheum by Mr. Gorham P. Stevens of New York, recently for two years Fellow in Architecture of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, whose drawings of the Erechtheum attracted much attention at the Archæological Congress held in Athens last spring. He proved most ingeniously and convincingly that this temple had on its east front two windows, the existence of which had not before been suspected, and he showed also the shape, size, and decoration of these windows, and their relation to the door. Similar in its ingenuity and convincing quality was the discussion of a noted so-called Hecatompedon inscription, by Mr. B. H. Hill of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts. He showed that the order of the two stones which bear this inscription has been mistaken hitherto, and that nine of the eleven known fragments of the second stone can be assigned to their proper relative places. These papers would have been notable if they had been read before the Berlin Academy of Sciences or any other learned body. Professor Prentice of Princeton University presented an interesting paper on Magic on Lintels and Amulets, interpreting some late Greek inscriptions which appeared unintelligible—explaining some letters as initials of familiar words, and showing other groups to be cryptic substitutes for words in which the Greek letters, taken together, had the same numerical value. Dr. Caroline L. Ransom of Bryn Mawr College, who has recently come to be a high authority on classical furniture, discussed Egyptian stools, chairs, and couches, showing the tendency to give these articles of furniture legs in the shape of animals' legs, as if the chair or couch were walking, and correcting the restorations in several museums, where the legs of the furniture appear to be walking in different directions.

The paper by Professor Burt G. Wilder of Cornell University on the Nomenclature of the Brain was one of the most important of those read before the Philological Association. But no synoptical report of all the papers read can be attempted here, and the highly finished Annual Address of Professor Herbert Weir Smyth of Harvard University, President of the Philological Association, cannot satisfactorily be given in summary. This called attention in particular to the conservative elements in Greek literature and life. Miss Alice Fletcher of Washington, who was to have given the presidential address before the Anthropological Association, unfortunately was detained by illness.

Before a joint meeting of the three associations Prof. E. L. Hewett of Washington presented a careful and authoritative statement of the measures recently adopted by departments of the United States Government for the preservation of American antiquities, and indicated the line of legislation which is desirable. The Committee on the Preservation of the Remains of American Antiquity joined with the Council of the Archæological Institute in approving measures for the preservation of the Mesa Verde remains in Colorado, for the safety of which the Cliff Dwellers' Association has long been laboring.

Professor Elmer T. Merrill of Trinity College was elected President of the Philological Association. The officers of the Archæological Institute and its affiliated Schools of Classical Studies in general were reëlected or held over. But Prof. John H. Wright of Harvard University offered his resignation of the editorship of the Journal of the Institute (the *American Journal of Archæology*), which he has conducted with signal ability and success for nine years. He will edit also, it is hoped, the forthcoming volume of the *Journal*. His successor was not elected. The question of the reconstruction of the editorial committee of the Institute is complicated because of the variety of its publications. A second volume of Supplementary Papers of the School in Rome, a Bulletin of the School at Athens, with an account of the excavations of the last ten years on the site of ancient Corinth, an elaborate illustrated report of Dr. Tozzer, who has been for four years the Institute's Fellow in American Archæology, pursuing researches in Central America, and, not least, Professor Frothingham's great work on the Arch at Beneventum, are only the most important of the publications which the Institute has in readiness for the printer.

The Council passed a complimentary resolution with regard to Prof. W. H. Goodyear's architectural surveys of mediæval buildings. The Archæological Society at Cincinnati was accepted as an affiliated society of the Institute, and similar societies in St. Louis, Kansas City, Indianapolis, and other cities, which were reported as in process of organization, will be accepted on their complying with certain conditions. The statement that $100,000 had been secured as an endowment fund for the School in Rome was received with great pleasure. This fund is almost exactly the same as that of the School at Athens. The income from these funds, naturally, is far from sufficient to meet the necessary expenses of these schools. Most of the necessary income still is derived from annual contributions, chiefly from colleges and graduates of colleges, but the Managing Committees are glad to have at least a considerable part of the necessary income assured. Probably no institutions in the country, with like means, during recent years, have accomplished more important work for the higher education than these schools at Athens and in Rome. The most important item in the report of the School in Palestine was that the headquarters of the School were no longer to be in the Grand Hotel at Jerusalem, but that a suitable building had been secured.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

At the opening of the meeting of the Managing Committee of the School at Athens, a brief and informal address was made in memory of the late Director of the School, Dr. Theodore Woolsey Heermance, who died in Athens at the close of last September, and sympathetic letters were read from foreign scholars, full of high appreciation of his work. No successor to Dr. Heermance was appointed, but this appointment, with certain instructions and limitations, was entrusted to a special committee.

THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION.

BALTIMORE, December 30, 1905.

The opening sessions of the Political Science and of the Historical Associations were held jointly on Tuesday evening, December 26, and were devoted to the address of welcome by President Remsen of Johns Hopkins University and the presidential addresses of Professor McMaster of the Historical Association and Professor Goodnow of the Political Science Association. President Goodnow took as his subject "The Growth of Administrative Discretion in the United States." After calling attention to the fact that a marked characteristic of English and American governmental polity, as compared with that of Continental systems, is the subjection of administrative officials to the control of the judiciary, Professor Goodnow dwelt upon the marked tendency of our courts in recent years to recognize the constitutionality of legislative acts granting great discretionary powers to those entrusted with the execution of the laws. As a conspicuous instance, he cited the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States upholding the validity of the Act of Congress which renders final the determinations of administrative officials with regard to the circumstances justifying the deportation of persons of Chinese descent, even though such persons claim to be native-born American citizens. This tendency to increase administrative powers the speaker showed to be caused and justified by the necessity for greater administrative efficiency if the governmental tasks of our present complex social and industrial life are to be satisfactorily performed. It is, therefore, a development which is not to be deprecated, even though it be away from the political ideas of the fathers of the Constitution. But, together with this increase of administrative powers which he thus approved, Professor Goodnow was careful to point out the correspondingly greater necessity of keeping purely administrative and technical matters beyond the control of partisan politics.

The second session, that of Wednesday morning, was largely devoted to a discussion of "Suffrage Conditions in the South"; Prof. Albert Bushnell Hart of Harvard University considering the question from the historical and political points of view, and Mr. John C. Rose, United States District Attorney of Baltimore, examining it in its constitutional aspects. Mr. Rose emphasized especially the fact that the Southern States have been able so successfully to disfranchise their adult male negroes, the Fifteenth Amendment to the contrary notwithstanding, not so much because of the limited powers of the general Government, as because Congress has not seen fit to exercise the constitutional powers which it has. Yet doubt was expressed whether, should those powers be exercised to their fullest extent, the negroes would profit by it. Certain formal legal rights would thus be secured to them, but only at the cost of increased racial animosities and social and economic discrimination against them. The reading of the papers was followed by a vigorous discussion of the topic, Mr. H. E. Shepherd presenting the Southern point of view with especial vehemence. Mr. J. T. Stephenson of Pendleton, N. C., admirably supplemented the principal papers by an account of racial distinctions in general as found in Southern statute law since the civil war. The morning session was concluded by a paper from Mr. George L. Fox of the University School, New Haven, on the subject of "Corrupt-Practices-at-Elections Acts since 1890 in the United States." Mr. Fox has for some years taken a very active part in the movement for purifying politics in his own State, and drafted the bill which was recently before the Connecticut Legislature. The conclusion which he drew from his personal experience and from his study of the experiences of other States, was that while such corrupt-practices acts as had been passed had in large measure remained dead-letter laws, there was no insuperable or even very serious difficulty in enforcing them when well drawn and supported by a strong public opinion.

The afternoon session of Wednesday was devoted to International Law and Diplomacy, the papers in the main centring around the recent great international drama in the East. Professor Latané of Washington and Lee University read a paper on "The Use of Neutral Waters by Belligerents," in which he showed the great divergence between the strict views upon this matter held by England and the United States, and the very lax ones held and practised by France. Prof. Amos S. Hershey of the University of Indiana, in an interesting paper, dwelt upon the extent to which recent events, especially those of the Far East, have resulted in still further increasing that friendship between England and the United States which England's attitude during the Spanish-American war so greatly stimulated. The concluding paper at this session was by Judge Simeon E. Baldwin, who compared the results of the Montevideo Congress of the seven South American Powers in 1888 with those of the Hague Conferences of most of the European nations in 1893, 1894, 1900, and 1904. The Montevideo Congress attempted a complete codification and dealt with universal rules, and its conclusions have been ratified by but a few Powers. The Hague Conferences more wisely confined their attention to a few subjects, such as marriage, guardianship, etc., and their conclusions upon them have been ratified by most of the European States. Mr. Arthur K. Kuhn of the New York bar, in discussing Judge Baldwin's paper, adverted to the extent to which American citizens are often hampered by local rules against aliens in litigating in European countries, and urged that, to correct this evil, as well as for other reasons, the United States should no longer keep aloof from the efforts that European nations are making to harmonize, upon particular points at least, their respective systems of civil jurisprudence.

The meeting of Thursday morning was a joint session, with the American Economic Association, the subject for discussion being "The Municipal Ownership of Public Utilities." The principal papers were read by Mr. F. C. Howe of Cleveland, O., and Prof. W. M. Daniels of Princeton University. Mr. Howe emphasized the advantages to be obtained from municipal ownership. The real question he declared to be not a commercial one, but one of democratic government, inasmuch as it is the corrupting influence of private franchises that is responsible for most of the corruption in our city politics. Professor Daniels, on the other hand, doubted whether the economy of municipal ownership has as yet been sufficiently demonstrated; and, as regards the purification of politics, was inclined to lay greater stress upon a better organization of city governments.

"The cure for our economic ills is to be found primarily in a political readjustment of the framework of city government. As I view the matter, there is no escape under a representative government from reposing responsibility in some person or persons. Let political responsibility be undivided, and let it be located so clearly that concealment is impossible; let the task of cashiering the dishonest or the incapable administrator or legislator be stripped of all indirection or subterfuge, and reduced to the greatest simplicity possible by a radical cut in the number of elected officials—and the choice between municipalization or a franchise policy becomes the comparatively simple question of the relative advantages of widening public control or of enlarging governmental administration."

At the session of Thursday afternoon, four papers dealing with different questions of politics were read. Miss Mary L. Hinsdale of Radcliffe College considered the history of the efforts that from time to time have been made to obtain admission of the heads of executive departments to the floor of Congress. Mr. Theodore Marburg of Baltimore presented a philosophical discussion of the principles of State interference. Whereas, in former years, liberty meant freedom of the individual from restraint by the State, it now often means State interference to protect the individual against oppression by others. Mr. Henry Jones Ford of Baltimore, in a vigorous paper, criticised those political scientists who, like Professor Burgess, would limit the scope of their inquiries to the analysis of the developed States of Europe and North America, thus excluding from study the very States—China, Russia, and Turkey—whose activities are at the present day the centres of disturbance in world politics. The last paper of the meeting was read by Mr. A. Maurice Low, who took for his topic "The Usurped Powers of the Senate." The usurpations upon which he particularly dwelt were the control that the upper house of Congress has gained in the matter of dictating Presidential appointments, or amending treaties and even of participating in their negotiations, and of the control of both revenue and appropriation bills.

Thursday evening was devoted to informal meetings of two of the various "Sections" which have been organized within the Political Science Association. The business meeting of the Association and the election of officers took place on Friday morning. The chief matter of business discussed was the future policy of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Association in the matter of publications. A strong sentiment in favor of the issuance by the Association of a quarterly journal was manifested, and a committee was appointed to consider the feasibility of the project, and thereupon to take the steps necessary for its realization. Dr. Albert Shaw of New York City was elected President of the Association, Prof. Albert Bushnell Hart, Mr. F. N. Judson, and Prof. H. A. Garfield, Vice-Presidents, and Prof. W. W. Willoughby of Johns Hopkins University, Secretary and Treasurer. Providence, R. I., was selected as the place for the next annual meeting. W. W. W.

AFTER TWENTY YEARS OF RESOLUTE GOVERNMENT.

DUBLIN, December 16, 1905.

The "twenty years of resolute governernment" which, according to Lord Salisbury, would settle the Irish question, have more than passed. Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Parnell, Lord Salisbury, have gone to their rest. Home Rule holds a place in the hearts of Irishmen much as it did twenty years ago. The demand for it is not accompanied by violence and disorder; therefore Englishmen do not now feel its necessity. A Liberal Ministry is in office. Lord Aberdeen has returned as Lord Lieutenant. There is none of the enthusiasm here that there was twenty years ago, when Mr. Gladstone and his party were in power. It is true that Mr. Morley, Mr. Bryce, and others who have ever since and all along shown the clearest conception of the necessity for radical change in Irish affairs, are now in the Ministry; but, as I have intimated, they are not backed by the enthusiasm that prevailed in England in the eighties. On both sides of the Channel we are older and graver. Seeing the peace which prevails here, the creditable manner in which county and local government committed to the people has been managed, and the better knowledge that prevails of the country through its having been opened up as a tourist resort, it is impossible that the former fierce opposition to Home Rule, based on the essentially iniquitous character of our people, could be maintained. On the other hand, the attitude of our Members towards the education question in England has left a soreness in the hearts of our English Liberal friends that is not likely ever to be fully eradicated. Here in Ireland, although Home Rule theoretically holds its old place and as many Members as formerly are pledged thereto, the inclination to sacrifice much for it has somewhat cooled. Local government and land legislation have satisfied many. There is less belief here than of old in any one measure, or any number of measures, affording a cure for all our ills. It is much to be doubted whether ecclesiasticism is really in favor of radical change; and the liquor interest, a powerful factor, alas! in our politics, better organized than formerly, cares more for itself than for the general good of the country.

Ireland, such as is left of it, though more shaded in opinion, its energies less concentrated and united towards one aim than in Mr. Parnell's time, is more generally really alive than then. Education has been doing its work. The Gaelic League has been an important influence for good in the country, giving the rising generation, male and female, other opportunities of showing their love for Ireland than by attending political meetings and swallowing all there uttered. We are not likely ever again in Ireland to find men wielding such unquestioned power as did O'Connell and Parnell. A section of Orangemen, while professing themselves still opposed to Home Rule, are coming to lose their dread of their Catholic fellow-countrymen, and to see that their mundane interests are identical. There is, perhaps, a more general opinion than ever before pervading all classes in the community that the present Castle régime must be changed. The workings of different land laws, of a different system of county government and education, the absence of an Established Church, render it more and more impossible for Englishmen to understand our affairs and legislate for us. Under Mr. Parnell's rule, the open expression of separatist opinion merged in the immediate hope of some form of nationality. A not insignificant body of our young men—their sentiments voiced in the columns of an able weekly, the *United Irishman*—now argue in favor of separation from England, at least on the Austro-Hungarian model, as the only satisfactory settlement. They heap ridicule on the Parliamentary party, and stigmatize Gladstonian Home Rule as but shadowy nationality.

It is best that these opinions should be openly expressed—that Englishmen should realize that Home Rulers are, in truth, the moderates. There is little doubt that, under a satisfactory settlement, such feelings would die out, as they did in Canada and Australia. Left to the management of our own affairs, the advantages of the connection are too patent not to be realized. We in Ireland have no record of self-centred nationality to hark back to, as there was in Italy, Hungary, Poland, and Finland, and as there is in Scotland. The unions existing between Sweden and Norway, and Austria and Hungary, were never of the clearly defined, incorporating character of the union Ireland generally would be willing to accept. It is unfortunate that, in the discussions of ten and twenty years ago, the connections of Norway-Sweden and Austria-Hungary were cited in favor of the union then contemplated between England and Ireland. Sweden and Norway have separated; there is a chronic state of unrest between Austria and Hungary. The Unionists are now naturally pointing with effect to the dénouement between those countries as the one certain result from material alteration in the present relations of England and Ireland.

Unity in political action is Ireland's only chance. There has, it is true, during the last hundred years been as much political union here as in other countries, but the majority has never occupied an official position where it could make itself respected. Therefore parties here always appear inchoate, and the least difference of opinion is put down to an ineradicable weakness in our character. At our corporations and public boards, in the management of our railways and commercial undertakings, there are no more serious differences of opinion than in other countries. The majorities rule, and we consequently hear nothing of their underlying disagreements. There are few instances of a country showing itself so generally united as Ireland, electing as it has done for the last quarter of a century a steady majority of four to one in favor of a particular measure. More striking still is the fact that four-fifths of her representatives, most of them poor men, many of them very able men, have resisted all the blandishments of London life and Government patronage, and have stoutly preserved their independence. All but Irish Nationalists who enter Parliament are sustained by the inspiring possibility of attaining Cabinet rank, of receiving titles, or securing lucrative settlements for life.

One of the strangest transformations that have ever occurred in public life has been performed by William O'Brien, once the spoiled darling of the Irish people, the embodiment of the idea of unity and discipline, the reuniter of parties after the Parnell split, the founder of the United Irish League. Two years ago he differed from three-fourths of his colleagues, including the ablest of them, upon a question of policy. He "retired from public life," "effaced himself," stopped the issue and sold off the plant of his paper, the *Irish People*. This "retirement" and "effacement" soon resolved themselves into a torrent of speech and oceans of print in virulent abuse of his old friends and comrades. He has, under the name of an "advisory committee," started what is in truth an organization in opposition to the League, and influenced a Parliamentary coterie apart from Mr. Redmond. He has now recommenced the publication of the *Irish People*. Through his marriage with a wealthy Russian lady he has large resources at command. There is no saying what trouble he may give in the coming elections.

To brace Ireland up for the election, to test the strength of Mr. O'Brien's following, to define the policy of the country, a convention was lately held under the presidency of Mr. Redmond and the Lord Mayor, in the Mansion House, Dublin—in the fine circular chamber built for the reception of George IV. in 1820, and mentioned in Byron's "Irish Avatar." Over 3,000 delegates attended from most parts of Ireland—a smaller proportion of them than usual from the south, where Mr. O'Brien's influence most prevails. It impressed me as the most representative and the weightiest of the conventions that have been held in Ireland during the past thirty years. The establishment of elective county, district, and urban councils has brought a larger proportion of thoughtful and responsible men to the front. Eleven hundred of the delegates were of this class. Sixty-three Irish members were present, and nearly three hundred Catholic clergy. There was a sprinkling of Protestants. The proceedings lasted two days and were harmonious. But one person spoke, and no one voted, in favor of Mr. O'Brien's proposals. Gladstonian Home Rule, as an "irreducible minimum," was demanded. The usual popular measures concerning land, laborers' dwellings, and education were ventilated.

Irish politicians are satisfied with Campbell-Bannerman's declarations so far. They have, however, been chilled by the admissions of Mr. Morley and others, whom they

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

most depended upon, that the Irish question in its wide sense is not now pressing. Mr. Bryce is one of Ireland's most convinced friends. Many regret that he is coming over as Chief Secretary. In the administration of the present hateful system, which he condemns, he can scarcely avoid finding himself in an unpopular position. There is some danger of opponents of a reasonable settlement setting pitfalls for him. It is possible that a man of such refined feelings, of such a literary and abstract turn of mind, may be disgusted and alienated by the rough necessities of his new responsibilities. William E. Forster would most probably have continued to follow Mr. Gladstone's lead in Irish affairs had he not been thrown in opposition, partly through the influence of the permanent officials through whom he worked in the same post that Mr. Bryce now fills.

It is unlikely that the full measure of Irish desires, such as Mr. Gladstone offered, can or will soon again be proposed by the Liberal party. All that can reasonably be expected at first is, that they will give themselves seriously to the passage of wide measures of devolution, such as handing over the principal Castle boards to an elective assembly, having at its disposal a definite portion of revenue drawn from Ireland. Without abating their conviction of the necessity of a more radical settlement, the Irish party could not refuse to support a Government that initiated changes which in their estimation would tend towards and prepare for a complete settlement. If, when Parliament meets, such are not promised or taken in hand, there is likely to be trouble between the Liberals and their former Irish allies. A good beginning is not being made in the retention as Vice-President of one of the principal Irish boards of Sir Horace Plunkett, who has not commended himself to national feeling.

Ireland has no desire to run the risk of further alienation from the Liberals on behalf of the English Catholics concerning education or otherwise. She may, however, through clerical influence, be driven into it. If this should happen, the relations between us and the Liberals may become more complicated even than at present.

Before closing, I may note an incident illustrative of the extraordinary character of Irish Castle government. Mr. Downes Martin, a Tipperary landlord, and his tenants have agreed as to the sale and purchase of an estate. It appears that the Castle had issued private instructions to the Estates Commissioners that wherever there was supposed to be intimidation on the part of the tenants, sales were to be indefinitely postponed. Two policemen have sworn that there was intimidation in this case. The landlord, his agent, and the tenants, all declare there had been none, that the arrangements between them had been freely and openly come to. The two policemen are believed, and the sale of the estate against the desires and to the loss of both landlord and tenants is broken off.

D. B.

LAMARTINE'S MARRIAGE.

PARIS, December 21, 1905.

Lamartine's reputation as a poet was made almost in a day; he could say, as was said of Byron, that he lay down and woke up famous. The 'Méditations,' which will be read as long as a French language lasts, were published in 1820. We know now, in all its details, the story of the relations of young Lamartine with Madame Charles, who was his inspirer; we know what influence this lady had upon him, and to this influence we may attribute the purity of the 'Méditations.' After her death, Lamartine was inconsolable, and it may be affirmed that he never again cherished the dream which he had cherished with Madame Charles in the solitude of Savoy. The 'Lac' will remain undying testimony to the character of the lofty passion of the young poet and of his inspirer.

The year which followed the death of the woman whom Lamartine has made immortal under the name of Elvire was the most unhappy of his life. He was entering on his twenty-ninth year; he had no object, no profession, no fortune. His family, on account of his delicate health, had prevented him from entering the army; literature was not, in those times, considered a paying profession; he had tried to enter the diplomatic service, but, so far, had not been successful; he spent most of his time at Milly, in the neighborhood of Macon. He fell ill towards the beginning of 1819, and went to Paris, to get medical advice. He was invited to several houses, where he recited some of his verses; he was handsome, had a melancholy and poetical face—his person had as great a success as his verses; but he received no encouragement from the Foreign Office, and he left, very much discouraged, for Aix-les-Bains with his friend Aymon de Virieu, in August, 1819.

He met there a young Englishwoman, whom he had seen already at Chambéry; he had forgotten her, but she had not forgotten him. Marian Eliza Birch was the only daughter of William Henry Birch and of Christina Cordelia Reessen. The father was dead, and she was living with her mother at Chambéry in Savoy. Lamartine first saw her there; she had heard much about him at the house of some French friends, and had heard him recite some of his verses. She became enthusiastic over him. She was twenty-nine years old, and when they saw each other again at Aix, their acquaintance rapidly became intimate.

Among the family papers which are kept in the Château of Saint-Point was found an envelope bearing this superscription in the hand of Mme. de Lamartine: "Letters of the year 1820, on my marriage." The envelope contains all the letters which the poet wrote for months to his future wife, from the time when he declared his love to her to the day of their marriage. There is found, besides, the official letter in which Lamartine's father asks for the hand of Miss Birch for his son. The correspondence, so carefully preserved, was at first secret. The first letter bears this endorsement: "Alphonse, Aix, 14th August, 1819"; it is a proposal of marriage. "I would beg you not to judge with severity the means which necessity forces me to take, and to read this letter to the end." It is clear from this beginning that Lamartine had received no encouragement from the mother of Miss Birch; in fact, after having declared his love, he says:

"We shall probably find on both sides obstacles of equal force, but no obstacle will be as strong as the sentiment which guides me. This sentiment, which I have known once in my life, could be torn from my heart only by the loss of what I loved. Since that time I have lived in a state of perfect indifference; but I have made your acquaintance, I have found in you so many perfect qualities, so much similarity between our tastes and feelings, so many perfections unknown perhaps to yourself, that I feel that I should be the happiest of men in uniting my days and destiny with yours."

The answer to this letter was not unfavorable, notwithstanding the efforts made by a friend of Miss Birch, Mademoiselle de la Pierre, who tried to hinder Miss Birch from getting engaged to Lamartine, and reminded her of his passion for Madame Charles. Mademoiselle de la Pierre represented Lamartine as a selfish man, who cared for nothing but her fortune. Long letters were written by Lamartine to Miss Birch in answer to the insinuations of Mademoiselle de la Pierre, and, after some hesitation, Miss Birch wrote to him a letter which was a formal promise.

There arose now a more difficult question, namely, to obtain the consent of the two families to the marriage. Lamartine had returned to Milly, where he unbosomed himself to his mother. Madame de Lamartine was anxious to see her son married, but Miss Birch was a Protestant; the brother-in-law and sisters-in-law of Madame de Lamartine, with whom she was anxious to be on the best of terms, were pious Catholics, and did not view with favor a union with a foreigner. They looked upon their nephew's project as too romantic and risky. Notwithstanding these difficulties, M. de Lamartine, the father, wrote on the 21st of September an official letter asking the hand of Miss Birch for his son. Mrs. Birch was still at Chambéry; Lamartine himself wrote also to her on the 26th of September, "in order to try to dissipate the unfavorable impressions which might perhaps be created in her mind by the differences of country and religion, and to allay the fear, so natural, of separation from what was dearest to her." He offered not only to live with her, but to spend a part of the year in England. Mrs. Birch sent, by return post, an answer to these two letters; it was a somewhat harsh and very decided refusal. She had evidently the impression that Lamartine was seeking for her fortune, and wrote: "My fortune is not considerable, and my daughter will have nothing in my lifetime but what I may give her." Moreover, in her answer to Lamartine she insisted upon the fact that he had no employment and very little fortune.

The formal opposition of her parent did not discourage Miss Birch; her mind was fixed, and she continued to correspond with Lamartine. "All my sorrows were forgotten," he wrote on the 22d of November, 1819, "the day I read that your sentiments had not altered, and that you had no part in the refusals which my family has received." He goes on to say that he had foreseen

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the question of his fortune would become a difficulty, and he adds:

"It is well that you should know exactly my position in this respect, as I have frankly set it before your mother. My family comes from good and ancient gentry, occupying by its origin and its fortune the first rank in its province. My father is the youngest of six children, having two brothers and three sisters; he alone is married. The totality of the fortune is about equally divided between all; this fortune, which, naturally as well as by their authentic intentions, reverts entirely to my sisters and myself, amounts to at least thirteen hundred thousand francs in land. . . . The declared intention of my parents, who live in the most perfect union, is that each of my sisters shall one day have one hundred and fifty thousand francs; there are five of them, which makes seven hundred and fifty thousand francs. You see what is to come to me. . . ."

The religious question, which was another difficulty, was settled by Miss Birch, who seems to have spontaneously offered Lamartine to turn Catholic. "I read," he writes to her on the 6th of December, 1819, "to my mother the little item in your letter on the point of religion; she was very much moved by it." In the same letter he avows having incurred some debts in his youth which were paid by his family. He confesses to have been one of "those inconsiderate and prodigal characters of whom you speak; I have indeed expiated it." Lamartine remained all his life one "of those inconsiderate and prodigal characters." He lived always too much in the world of dreams. Immediately after a long account of his money affairs, he sends to Miss Birch the last "Méditation" which he had composed—"La Prière," beginning with

"Le roi brillant du jour se couchant dans sa gloire."

"I am sorry," he says, "to have covered a page and a half with these verses, but if they please you a moment, I pardon myself." They did please Miss Birch, and we cannot wonder at it. She loved the poet, and would have none of the questions which occupied the two families of Lamartine and Birch come between them. What she was as a girl, she remained as a woman; Lamartine was really her god.

Lamartine's reputation as a poet was rapidly extending. We have all the letters which he wrote to Miss Birch from Paris; he was named *attaché d'ambassade*, and Mrs. Birch's opposition to the marriage ended at last. The 'Méditations' appeared on the 13th of March, 1820. They formed a volume of 116 pages, containing twenty-four poems, without any author's name. Lamartine wrote to Miss Birch: "I have just published a small volume which has a success here that astonishes me, especially in this anti-poetical time. I have kept the first copy for you. The beginning and the end of all my actions belongs now to you." He was thinking of her when he wrote these verses:

"Au fond de cette coupe où je buvais la vie
Peut-être restait-il une goutte de miel.
Peut-être l'avenir me gardait-il encore
Un retour de bonheur. . . ."

—an allusion to the past which Miss Birch well understood. The marriage contract was signed in May. Mrs. Birch gave her daughter 10,000 pounds sterling, keeping for herself the income, a part of which only (6,000 francs) went to Lamartine and his wife. The marriage ceremony took place at Pugny, near Chambéry; the father of Lamartine was represented by Count Joseph de Maistre. Thereupon Lamartine and his wife left for Italy, with Mrs. Birch. Madame de Lamartine remained always what we have seen her at first; she was entirely and absolutely devoted to her husband and to his glory.

Correspondence.

FOOTBALL REFORM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Most of the suggestions that have been made public concerning the reform of college football, seem to go wide of the mark, because they are not aimed at the real evil. The maiming, or even the killing, of a boy now and then during a game is not of great consequence except to the boy himself, and to his family and friends. The real evil of the game, under present conditions, is the debasing of the ideals, not of college boys alone, but of all the boys in the country that are large enough to wear trousers. The most captivating honors in school are now to be won, not in the classroom, but on the athletic field. It is the monstrous disproportion between work and play in school life that needs reforming, not the rules of the game.

So long as a dozen youngsters are permitted to go out and earn $50,000 in a day, playing football, and, worse yet, are permitted to spend it all for sport in a single season, it matters not what the rules of the game are. A pillow-fight for such stakes would be as mischievous.

What could be more grotesque than the make-believe efforts of college faculties to keep college sports on an amateur basis, by prohibiting the earning during vacation of a few dollars in playing the game by the members of a team, and permitting them to make it their main business, in term-time, to train, get into condition, and earn thousands of dollars by the same means?

The point of view of the candidates of the teams is that of the professional; the training for the games is that of the professional; and the spirit in which the games are played is worse than that of the professional, who allows no unfair slugging, even in prize-fights. The American college undergraduate is fast losing all conception of any difference between amateur sport and professional gaming.

If the playing of college games for money were prohibited, and the sports otherwise were put on a purely amateur basis, with some moderate restrictions as to the amount of time that may be devoted to sport in term-time, the matter of the rules of the game might safely be left with the boys, where it belongs; and it seems likely that, after a little while, work and play in school would resume their proper perspective.

FRANK W. PROCTOR.

FAIRHAVEN, MASS., December 29, 1905.

WHAT THE NAVY NEEDS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I have a briefer answer than yours to the question What the Navy Needs. It needs destruction. There are reasons for believing that the time has come when the Christian nations must face the question of disarmament. The rampant militarism bred by war and breeding war in its turn is not only a gigantic crime: it goes to the limit of senselessness and absurdity, and excites the disgust of all right-minded men. This implies, of course, that the President is not a right-minded man. I have read carefully what he says in his recent message about "demagogues of peace" and disarmament, and I seem to be the only man in the country that has done so. That such argument should be accepted without comment is sufficient proof of the intellectual and moral confusion of the times.

Roosevelt to the contrary notwithstanding, I here affirm that there are no "demagogues of peace," and cannot be in the present condition of human opinion; and that the Rooseveltian proposition that "disarmament can never be of prime importance" is the contrary of the truth It would be nearer the truth to say that it alone is of prime importance. But here a misapprehension must be corrected. It is not, as the President assumes, "the free peoples, the enlightened, independent, and peace-loving peoples, who, on the whole, stand for justice," that are invited to disarm; there are no such peoples on the globe. The armies and navies that menace the peace of the world and impose upon us an intolerable burden of taxation, are now maintained by the "barbarisms" and "despotisms" that call themselves "Christian"; and it is this stupendous mockery and hypocrisy that the handful of men whom the President stigmatizes as "demagogues of peace" would abolish.

"There is more need to get rid of the causes of war than of the implements of war," says the President. But what if among the causes of war the implements of war hold a conspicuous place? What if a navy is a challenge to combat rather than a guaranty of peace? What if the Rooseveltian doctrine of the navy as a guaranty of peace is contradicted by universal experience and discredited by enlightened reason?

ALVAH F. HAMILTON.

GRANVILLE, O., January 1, 1906.

THE ARRANGEMENT OF MUSEUMS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your last issue, Professor Moore finds danger in a policy of choice in museum collections between objects of artistic interest for public exhibition and objects of scientific interest for private study. Nevertheless, that such a policy has the sympathy of the instructed public, is indicated by a quotation from the last number of *Le Musée*, which has come to hand as I write:

"The public is accustomed to consider the Louvre as a museum of art; and it does not look favorably upon the choice of works which have merely the interest of curiosity. We have secondary museums where the learned can accumulate to their hearts' content the paintings and sculpture of minor artists, noteworthy mainly for their rarity. Here belong also collections of archæological fragments which, however they may aid us in following the artistic or political developments of nations, are nevertheless incapable of giving either a vision of art or a vital lesson, and have significance only under the glass of the expert."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*Le Musée*, Revue d'Art Antique, Paris, Nov.-Dec., 1905, II. 6. 'Le Carnet de l'Amateur,' p. 2.)

Very truly yours, I. L. M.

January 3, 1906.

Notes.

Houghton, Mifflin & Co. have in preparation a so-called "manuscript edition" of Thoreau's complete writings, limited to 600 sets, "each containing a page of Thoreau's autograph manuscript." The illustrations will be from photographs. The last fourteen of the twenty volumes will contain the Journal, edited by Bradford Torrey.

J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia, have in preparation for the spring 'The Fall of Tsardom,' by Carl Joubert; 'Consumption: Its Relation to Man and Civilization,' by John Bessner Huber, M.D.; and 'Heroes of Discovery in America,' by Charles Morris.

A new, extensively revised edition of Champlin's 'Young Folks' Cyclopædia of Common Things' will be issued directly by Henry Holt & Co.

The *Vossische Zeitung* of Berlin reports the details of a contemplated chronological edition of Goethe's poems under the auspices of the Berlin Gesellschaft für Deutsche Literatur. In the address of the chairman, Prof. Erich Schmidt, in which the work was outlined, attention was drawn to the fact that Goethe had himself emphatically refused to publish his works in chronological order, and that Heine and Scherer regarded the æsthetic arrangement adopted by the great poet as indispensable for the proper appreciation of their beauties. But Schmidt considers a chronological edition demanded for scientific and literary reasons, and proposes to arrange the poems under the following heads: (1) The poems down to the Strassburg period, 1770; (2) to the autumn of 1771; (3) to November, 1775; (4) to the Italian journey; (5) all others according to Goethe's own arrangement.

Mr. Justin McCarthy's 'History of Our Own Times' (Harpers) is brought to a close by the recent publication of the fourth and fifth volumes. These carry the story from Queen Victoria's Jubilee in 1897 to her death in 1901. Mr. McCarthy's method, style and point of view are too widely known to require comment; it will suffice to say that the level of previous volumes is maintained. A considerable space is devoted to a retrospect of the social, literary, and artistic aspects of Victoria's reign.

A very interesting personage is the subject of a thesis by Mr. A. E. Shaw entitled 'Michel de l'Hospital and his Policy' (Henry Frowde). L'Hospital stands out among his contemporaries in France nearly as strongly as More does in England; and although Mr. Shaw does not venture on the broad field of historical parallels, yet he does useful work by his painstaking summary of the subject.

In his 'Monopolies, Trusts, and Kartells' (London: Methuen), Mr. F. W. Hirst contends that competition is still the life of trade. Even as to railways, he holds that the case for great combinations has not been made out. Experience, he thinks, is against the assumption that competing roads will come to an agreement as to traffic for which they are rivals. Admitting that competition cannot entirely solve the transportation problem, the author favors, not nationalization, but control which will fix rates, encourage competition, discourage amalgamation, and prevent personal discrimination. Railway monopoly, at most, merely means a margin of superiority over waterways, trams, busses, and human legs! As weapons of defence, public authorities may employ alternative means of transport, especially canals, and potential rail routes, as well as taxation, in dealing with roads charging high rates or "unrighteously struggling after monopoly." Mr. Hirst charges protective tariffs with the entire responsibility for Trusts. The balance of economies of large organizations has not increased in the last fifty years; and Trusts, he thinks, have betrayed in times of emergency the same signs of weakness as competitive industries. The real purpose of Trusts is to raise prices; and in free-trade countries no Trust can raise prices above the natural or international level. He says, in fact: "Most if not all the English Trusts are merely large, well-organized business concerns which are so cleverly managed that they earn for a time enormous business profits, and perhaps undersell and ruin most of their competitors, so as to establish temporarily a quasi-monopoly. In course of time, however, they decline and fall before new and more energetic competitors."

In our recent remarks on "Yale Studies in English," no reference was made to the latest member of the series, No. XXIX. (already published then, but not at hand), a voluminous edition of Ben Jonson's "The Devil is an Ass." The editing, by Dr. W. S. Johnson, if not inspired, is on the face of it an honest attempt at scholarly thoroughness. As against 122 pages of Jonson's text, there are 200 pages of introduction, notes, etc. This material a more experienced and self-denying editor, for example Professor Dowden, would undoubtedly have managed to condense, omitting many of the notes. It is questionable whether "the present editor" has denied us any of the "results" of his "study." In fact, like several other members of the series, this seems to suffer from what may be called a lack of artistic restraint in annotation. Shunning difficulties by silence is more common.

A new revision of the Schlegel-Tieck German translation of Shakspere, by Professor Conrad, has just made its appearance in five elegant volumes issued by the Deutsche Verlagsanstalt of Stuttgart. That a revision of this standard text was necessary had been recognized on all hands, and efforts in this direction had been repeatedly made. Conrad's labor has been expended largely on the metre, the exact reproduction of the thought, and the correction of blunders on the part of earlier translators.

Ferdinand von Richthofen's last work, an incomplete report of the 'Ergebnisse und Ziele der Südpolerforschung,' which he had begun to prepare by direction of the Kaiser, has been printed at the special request of the latter, and published by the house of Dietrich Reimer, Berlin. The famous geographer gives a thorough survey of the problems to be solved by the south-polar expeditions, and describes particularly the services of the German expedition under Von Drygalski, a pupil of Von Richthofen, in this direction, above all in the investigation of the fauna and flora of the regions explored. This is the extent to which Von Richthofen had completed his work, but no materials have been found to indicate how he intended to continue it, beyond a discussion of such problems as the meteorology and kindred subjects of the polar world.

The *Deutsche Medizinische Wochenschrift* reports that the fears entertained some years ago, when women were admitted to the study of medicine at the German universities, that they would in the course of time prove serious rivals to male practitioners, have been proved unfounded. Official statistics, as well as the special investigations of Dr. Johanna Maass, have shown that, since the year 1900, only forty-six women have been admitted to practice in Germany, and only six have become dentists. Only thirty-one women physicians could still be traced, and, of these, nine are found in Berlin; of the six women dentists only one is in the capital city. Of the thirty-one reporting, twenty-four confine their practice to women and children, four are specialists, and three are assistants at medical institutes. State examinations were taken by these women in eleven university towns, and thirty took academic degrees. Four are married.

The Cultus Ministerium of Rumania has arranged with the German Government to establish a Philological Seminary for the Rumanian language in connection with the University of Berlin. The new arrangement is to go into operation during the present winter semester, and the work is to be in charge of Dr. Heinrich Tiktin, who will bear the title of ordinary professor in the University. The Rumanian Government devotes 20,000 francs per year to this new departure.

The Japan Year-Book Office in Tokio issues for one dollar, gold, a 'Japan Year-Book' of 400 indexed pages in 29 chapters, with appendix, giving the usual facts, figures, and descriptions appropriate to such a publication, including a sketch of the late war, diplomacy, finance, texts of the Anglo-Japanese alliance and the Korean treaty, and (what will interest foreign readers more than anything else) 60 pages of biographical data concerning "contemporary worthies," forming a pretty fair beginning for a Japanese 'Who's Who.' Though written by Japanese, the English is very good, and next year's edition is promised for May.

While Japan affects the benevolent assimilation of Korea's foreign policy and professes virtuous abstinence from interference in her domestic concerns, it is good to have an independent critic, with at least respectable powers of observation and judgment, who is bold enough to speak the truth as he sees it. The delayed October number of the *Korea Review* contains a powerfully written arraignment of "Japan as a Colonizer," showing the abominable customs of the low-class subjects of the Mikado. From them, and not from the polished gentry, comes the typical man now domineering this Oriental Finland. They "do not hesitate to kick and beat and rob Koreans right and left"; they "build in Seul on a prominent site a huge brothel, housing hundreds of the votaries of vice, and flaunt it in the face of Koreans"; they have "not

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one word of genuine sympathy nor a hint as to real helpfulness," nor have the official class of Japanese "the primary and fundamental qualifications for successful handling of the Korean people." The article on "The Korean Customs Service" is a valuable historical review of what is righteous and what is rotten in the finances of the now prostrate empire virtually absorbed by Japan. In the news calendar we read that "experiments with American cotton seed in Korea having proved successful beyond expectation, the Cotton Association has arranged to establish thirty seed-cotton farms in various sections of Korea."

The trade of the United States with the principal countries of the world will be the subject of a series of articles to be published weekly during the coming year by the Department of Commerce. It began on January 1 with the United Kingdom, showing what our trade with that country was in 1905, and the principal articles which formed the exports and imports, and comparing present conditions with those of earlier years. The design of the series is to stimulate the public interest in this study of our foreign commerce.

The October number of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* began publication of Washington's Household Account-book, 1793-97, in the Society's possession. The first eighth is in the handwriting of Tobias Lear, the rest in that of Bartholomew Dandridge. Of more curious interest is a translation of parts of a one-act drama, with analysis of the whole, by "Polonius" Kotzebue, called "The Quaker," in which the principal actors are Lord Howe and his son and Warner ("Walter") Mifflin and his. The verisimilitude on the Quaker side is noticeable, and the interview seized upon is historic. The translation is by Amelia M. Gummere.

A correspondent writes: "In last week's *Nation* (December 28) there is, under Notes, a brief notice of the latest issue ('Lear') of the pocket edition of the First Folio, 'so scrupulously edited by Misses Porter and Clarke.' I have just read 'Hamlet' in this edition, and surely every teacher and student of Shakspere must feel under obligation to both editors and publishers. The least excellent part of the editorial work is to be found, under 'Literary Illustrations,' in the interpretation of difficult passages, where the light of the New English Dictionary seems to have been shut out, and old guesses are repeated."

—Against the proposed rate legislation the charge of impracticability is brought with great force, in the January *Century*, by President Samuel Spencer, of the Southern Railway. The burden of his argument is that no such commission as is proposed could deal effectively and satisfactorily with the innumerable intricate questions which arise, and many of which must receive almost instantaneous adjustment unless serious injury is to be done to important business interests, often involving extensive sections of the country. The railroads themselves, we are told, find it necessary to employ about eight hundred traffic experts, in addition to something like three thousand soliciting and travelling freight agents, whose duty it is to study the peculiar and constantly changing conditions of their various sections. Can this intricate mechanism be subjected to the positive rate-making power of an outside commission, necessarily composed of comparatively inexperienced men, without serious danger of throwing vast business interests into disastrous confusion? President Spencer thinks not. Congressmen who are proposing to pass beyond the punishment and restraint of actual abuses and take up the positive direction of the traffic business, would do well to ponder the reasons for his opinion. For the Franklin anniversary, the *Century* has had the good fortune to secure a paper by the late Secretary Hay, on Franklin in France, prepared for delivery in Chicago some years ago, but never used because of Mr. Hay's ill-health at the time. Mr. Hay humorously calls attention to the fact that our first foreign minister was a defeated candidate for Congress, Silas Deane, who was sent to France some months in advance of Franklin and Arthur Lee. "A quiet legation is the stuffed mattress which the political acrobat wants always to see ready under him in case of a slip."

—The selections from Bancroft's letters and diaries, which have been a marked feature of *Scribner's* for some months past, come to an end in the January issue with the close of his diplomatic service at Berlin. The extracts are largely of a personal nature, and bring the reader into contact with many eminent characters, including Lepsius, Bekker, Ranke, Trendelenburg, Hofmann, and Curtius, together with various men of high political rank. In one letter we have an account of the escape of the Empress from Paris, in 1870, the details of which Mr. Bancroft had from Dr. Evans himself, shortly after the event. One of the most pleasant incidents of his service was the formal renewal, by the University at Göttingen, of the doctor's degree which he had received just fifty years before. Thomas F. Millard, writing of the settlement between Japan and Russia, shows an emphatic unwillingness to believe that any lasting equilibrium has been established. Korea is simply held under Japanese tutelage by force, with no hope for a restoration of freedom, and there is no promise of any genuine reversion to Chinese administration in Mantchuria. On the basis of personal observation during repeated sojourns in Mantchuria, he expresses the conviction that Japan, during her short occupation of southern Mantchuria, has done far more to destroy Chinese autonomy than Russia had ever done. Of course, there is the inevitable corollary, from the whole situation, that the United States should largely increase its naval strength in the Pacific. If the germs of that conclusion do not exist in any premises whatever, it will at once appear by spontaneous generation.

—Judge Francis C. Lowell opens the *Atlantic* with a plea against the adoption by this country of a strictly professional diplomatic service. We could ill afford, he thinks, to adopt a method which would in the past have excluded from our foreign service such men as Motley, Bayard Taylor, Choate, Lowell, and Andrew D. White, ministers whose general culture and ability have proved of far more value to us than any amount of mere professional training. Our ministers to Great Britain during the past half-century are compared with the lists of British ministers to this country and to France, to the decided advantage of the American list. The European method, he thinks, sacrifices initiative to routine, and so fails in great emergencies. Incidentally he touches upon one serious result of the fact that small salaries have led gradually to the almost exclusive selection of our leading ministers from the wealthy classes. Forced to use of their own funds, they expend altogether too lavishly, and so establish a precedent very burdensome to any successor of less, or possibly even of similar, wealth. To establish conditions under which no one but a multi-millionaire would consent to hold an ambassadorship, would evidently be a great misfortune. The growing evil should be controlled, he suggests, by setting the salary at a reasonable figure, and giving strong intimation to the incumbent that expenditure beyond this sum would be looked upon with serious disfavor. Samuel P. Orth writes of special legislation in our State Legislatures, with reference to the possibility of some substitute. Many requests for such legislation are inherently equitable, but the whole field of private bills belongs rather to the realm of adjudication than that of legislation, and the Legislature should be relieved by the creation of some properly constituted body to deal with business of this nature. Great advantage would be gained, he thinks, by a return to the old New England idea of local self-government. In the absence of some effective method of dealing with merely local and private matters, constitutional prohibitions are and must ever be ineffective to prevent special legislation.

—Among the innumerable exceptions to Dr. Osler's famous dictum we beg leave to catalogue one Dr. Lavendar, of Old Chester, Pennsylvania, who, at an age of presumable incapacity, again steps forward, in the pages of *Harper's*, as leading character in a new novel. Is it not about time for the establishment of a Carnegie fund to lighten the labors of aged characters in the field of fiction? Mr. Nevinson's slave-trade investigation continues in the same depressing strain. He believes, though admittedly without conclusive evidence, that efforts were made to poison him by parties interested in suppressing his revelation of present conditions. A forecast of his closing paper, to appear in February, indicates a severe arraignment of England for her neglect of alleged responsibility in the matter, and an urgent call to our own Government to enter vigorous protest against the continuance of the evil. Less harrowing to the nerves are a number of articles of more remote ethnological interest, including a description of recent mound explorations in the Black Warrior River region of Alabama, by H. Newell Wardle of the Philadelphia Academy of Natural Sciences, a collection of legends of the City of Mexico, by Thomas A. Janvier, and a paper on the Indian music of South America, by Charles Johnson Post. The Easy Chair is moved by the Conway autobiography to moralize entertainingly on the old problem whether there was really any possibility that the evils of the past should have been by choice avoided, while Dr. Alden, in the Study, still continues to find grounds for an optimistic view of present-day literature.

—The quarterly periodical by way of eminency, the Oxford English Dictionary (H. Frowde), continues in its January issue the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

letter R (Reign-Reserve) under the direction of Mr. W. A. Craigie. The prefix re- of course plays an extensive part in this section—Reign to Reserve—and it would puzzle not only a foreigner but a native to distinguish it in every case, and to pronounce rapidly the words here found in juxtaposition. Reigning, Reignite, Reillume, Reim, Reimage, are examples found on the first page. We have marked for notice some proofs of the birthright fluidity and redundancy of our speech. Relation (kinsman) is recorded for 1502; Relative, at a decent interval, for 1657. From 1485 Repository was spelt with penultimate *o*: in 1862, Dean Goulburn (or shall we rather say his printer?) preferred *a*, and now one may take his choice. In 1832 Harriet Martineau used the form Reproduceable; in 1834, Reproducible, the handier of the two. Repertory, in the sense of 'index, list,' goes back to 1552, and first in 1845 annexes the meaning of dramatic stock; from 1847 to 1885 the French *répertoire* was adopted as French; in 1897 one no longer feels called upon to italicize the word, whose naturalization is assured by dropping the accent of the first *e*. We have now, consequently, two English equivalents. Similarly, in 1451, Replevy was English for the writ, side by side with the Anglo-French Replevin. Renown (by way of Anglo-French) was well established in the fourteenth century, but Chaucer took over Renomee' from Old French, while Lord Berners, translating Froissart in 1523, adventured Reno'me, which it would have been handy to keep for poetic resource (as would Remenant for Remnant). Finally, the spellings Repellant and Repellent have an equal age and authority.

—There are plenty of people who still need to be told that Reliable is a grand old English word (1569), even if it came into familiar use only some three centuries later, Coleridge meantime (1816) building Reliability upon it; Mr. Craigie briefly sets this forth, with a mention of analogies and a proper reference to the late Fitzedward Hall's standard work on adjectives in -able, -ible. Under Religion is noted Cicero's derivation (*relegere*, 'to read over again'), along with our modern preference for *religare*, 'to bind,' in the effort to find a definition and a sanction. Under Reins is a curious quotation from Wyclif's version of Ezekiel ix. 2: "O man . . . clothid with lynnen, and an ynkhorn of a wryter in his reynes," where the King James version reads: "And one man among them was clothed with linen, with a writer's inkhorn by his side." Reporter (for the press) turns up in 1815, but the verb to Report only about 1850—Reportorial, which seems not to have been laughed down as irregular, in 1860. Reminisce, which suggests journalistic coinage, began as transitive verb in 1829, and was in intransitive employ in 1882. Addison (1702) is cited for Republic of Letters, showing one phase of the Oxford Dictionary as a book of familiar quotations. The older parties grow, the more difficult it is to formulate their principles, so we will conclude with Mr. Craigie's account of what constitutes Republicanism in the United States: "A party . . . which favors liberal interpretation of the Constitution, extension of the central power, and a protective tariff."

—The eleventh annual meeting of the Central Division of the Modern Language Association of America occurred at Madison, Wis., December 27-29. "The attendance," writes a correspondent, "was somewhat smaller than on former occasions, yet about one hundred were present at the opening session. As hosts, the faculty of the University of Wisconsin were ideal. Their hospitality was Western in its cordiality, Southern in its graciousness. To receptions, luncheons, and smokers the members of the Association have been accustomed; but to a hospitality that included the entertainment of the visitors during the entire meeting at the homes of the members of the general faculty of the University, they have hitherto been strangers. Of the papers presented at the meeting it is impossible to speak in detail. The chairman's address does, however, demand special mention. Professor Blackburn chose as his theme 'A Neglected Branch of the Teaching of English.' This neglect he defined as 'training in talking, in the oral use of the mother tongue—not oratory, lectures, etc., but the use of speech in the ordinary events of life.' Professor Blackburn pointed out the fundamental distinction between learning to speak a language and learning to read and write it. The one depends upon the memorizing of facts, the other upon the gaining of skill through practice. They are, therefore, two distinct branches. But modern social life, while rendering both indispensable, has provided very inadequately for the former. The child acquires such knowledge of the mother tongue as he may through the associations of home, playground, and the street; a large part of the instruction thus given being ill fitted to develop correct habits of speech. In the secondary school the conditions are scarcely more favorable. Here the training in oral speech is confined mostly to the correction of bad habits of speaking, and does not tend toward the development of either fluency or correctness. In the college, conditions are, if possible, still more unfavorable. Here special attention is given to practice in writing, while practice in speaking is almost wholly neglected. The result of all this neglect of systematic training in the use of the spoken word is a lamentable inability on the part of most of us to express our meaning clearly and forcibly when occasion calls for it. The causes of this inability are many. One of the commonest is a lack of a stock of words thoroughly at command. Another cause is inexactness in the use of words, due to ignorance of their meaning and connotation. Mispronunciations, grammatical faults, slovenly utterance, and similar defects make up the sum total of the deplorable lack of skill in the use of speech so apparent among us. The remedy is to be found in more practice. Professor Blackburn suggested the use of oral themes as a part of the rhetorical training in school and college classes. He urged also that all recitations in any subject be treated as exercises in the development of correct habits of speech. In the study of foreign languages, ancient and modern, is afforded the best possible training in oral speech, since translation is a kind of oral composition. By such means, without burdening the overcrowded curriculum of the schools with new subjects, may teachers do much to supply the defects of early training in the use of the mother tongue. At the business meeting which concluded the sessions, officers for the ensuing year were chosen as follows: For chairman, Prof. E. P. Baillot of Northwestern University; for secretary, Prof. C. B. Wilson of the State University of Iowa, to succeed Prof. Raymond Weeks, whose resignation was accepted with regret. The executive committee will consist of Profs. T. A. Jenkins of the University of Chicago, H. M. Belden of the University of Missouri, and M. F. Liberma of the University of Cincinnati. The next meeting will be held at Chicago. The increase in membership of the Association during the past year has come largely from the Middle West. The total active membership is now 708."

SEA POWER IN 1812.

Sea Power in its Relations to the War of 1812. By Capt. A. F. Mahan, D.C.L., LL.D., U. S. N. 2 vols. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1905.

In these handsome volumes, uniform with his other works on Sea Power, Captain Mahan is at his best. He has descended from the clouds of prophecy and speculation to walk with firm tread upon ground which he has made peculiarly his own. The involved and obscure style, so appropriate to the utterances of the seer, has disappeared, remaining, if at all, only as an occasional echo from the past, while the vigor of his sentences reflects the confident holding of opinions wherein lurks no shadow of doubt. Combined with these beliefs is a fine sense of responsibility to make others share them, and to present the course of the events which led to the War of 1812 as the inevitable result of certain economic and maritime doctrines carried to their logical extreme by one nation, which possessed an abundance of sea power, against a second, comparatively destitute both of the means and the will to resist. Others have recited the chronicles of the War of 1812, but it was reserved to Capt. Mahan to write its history. As an analyst, he traces the vexations and irritations precedent to hostilities back to their ultimate source; as a strategist, he describes the several campaigns and their incidents, both naval and military; and, as a naval officer, he perceives and preaches the inconceivable folly of not providing, in time, some respectable measure of defence.

The high plane from which he views this period can be best illustrated by suggesting that he appears to consider military and naval events, interesting and memorable as they are, as of no greater importance than the occurrences which brought them about. A few fights on land and sea are to him of less moment than the mighty flow of a country's development. A political principle, whether right or wrong, adopted by a sturdy people, maintained with inflexible resolution for nearly two centuries, accepted as the only possible means of self-preservation, regarded as the fountain of national prosperity, and never formally abandoned, is a large enough factor in the world's affairs to challenge the respect of the author, and to warrant his devoting to its unfolding over one-third of his eight hundred and thirty-odd pages. No better index of the general scope of this

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

work is needed than the large proportion it gives to antecedent and determining causes, a subject which Mr. Roosevelt, for example, in his 'Naval War of 1812,' very properly dismisses in half a dozen pages, as being aside from his purpose.

Capt. Mahan is quite right in saying that "it may seem at first far-fetched to go back to 1651 for the origins of the War of 1812; but without such preliminary consideration it is impossible to understand, or to make due allowance for, the course of Great Britain." The Navigation Act of that year, framed with the intent of forcing commerce into English bottoms as an indispensable agency for reaching British consumers, directed that "no merchandise from Asia, Africa, or America, including the colonies, should be imported into England in other than English-built ships, belonging to English subjects, and of which the master and mariners are also, for the most part of them, of the people of this commonwealth." "Foreign merchantmen," so Capt. Mahan points out, "might import into England the products of their own country; but both they and English vessels must ship such cargoes in the country of origin, not at any intermediate port." Later, a concession to foreign vessels was

"further qualified by heavier duties, called aliens' duties, upon their cargoes; and by the requirement that three-fourths of their crew entering English ports should be of the same nationality as the ship. The object of this regulation was to prevent the foreign state from increasing its tonnage by employing seamen other than its own. This went beyond mere protection of English vessels, and was a direct attack, though by municipal law, upon the growth of foreign shipping."

Having stated the aim of this and subsequent legislation by Parliament, the building up of British commerce, and the increasing of the number of English seamen available for employment in time of war, the author proceeds steadily and surely, by a chain of exceptional occurrences and through the devious paths of diplomacy and negotiation, to the day of our rupture with Great Britain, fortifying his conclusions at every step by reference to original documents or other acknowledged authority. England's attitude on the ocean towards foreign vessels was a natural corollary to the position she had assumed in her great Navigation Act. It was that of the strong man who deliberately ignores the rights of the weak. Adopted at first for selfish reasons, its maintenance in the gigantic struggle with Napoleon was held to be essential to England's very existence. No British writer could more luminously or powerfully write the brief for his own country's policy than has Capt. Mahan, in his desire to do strict justice to both parties to a quarrel wherein no adjustment was possible without sacrifice of principles conceived to be vital. Even the impressing of British seamen on board American ships, on the ground that allegiance was inalienable and that the King was entitled to the services of his subjects wherever found, which is commonly supposed to have been the chief ground for hostilities, had a certain show of reason at a time when, without sailors to man her ships, Great Britain would have fallen under the French sway. The practice was not at all universally reprobated by leading Americans at the very time. Galling beyond description were the restrictions put upon our shipping.

"The American found exerted over his national commerce a control indistinguishable in practice from that of colonial days. From what ports his ships should sail, whither they might go, what cargoes they might carry, under what rules be governed in their own ports, were dictated to him as absolutely, if not in as extensive detail, as before the War of Independence."

Under such conditions as these, the only wonder is that the break was so long deferred.

These opening chapters could not be shortened without injury. They are of absorbing interest, dealing with happenings often of a thrilling nature, and with a vivid play of human passions and prejudices on the largest scale. Their reading must, not infrequently, be exceedingly painful to us Americans, even if we do not all share Capt. Mahan's contempt for Jefferson, whose preference for gunboats, non-intercourse acts, and embargoes distinctly invited the indignities and insults to which the flag was subjected. The latter was not respected even when hoisted on board a national vessel. We can see how a little firmness and preparation, in season, would have spared us much humiliation, probably war itself. We must grieve over the position of the United States, whose commerce seemed likely to be crushed out of existence between the upper millstone of the Berlin Decrees and the nether millstone of the Orders in Council, and we blush for our duplicity in contending with France that the Emperor had not rescinded the Berlin Decrees, and, at the same instant, with Great Britain that we had. We shall never be great as a people until we cease being "smart."

In his preliminary discussion of the theatre of war and the strategy dictated by geographical conditions and by our own paucity of naval force, Capt. Mahan points out that the United States on the land could move offensively only on the Northern frontier, where reasons of both political and military expediency combined to impose prompt action. On the sea, she might harrass British commerce to some extent, but she could deliver no really effective blow against Britain's overwhelming fleet. Upon these two considerations might have been based a correct plan of campaign, involving a skilful disposition of our few ships, on the one hand, and a vigorous use of our army, on the other. It is interesting to note that; of the three officers whose opinions were asked by the Navy Department, to Commodore John Rodgers, who alone held broad and sound views as to the employment of our scanty marine, fate denied the opportunity of personal distinction which fell to the lot of his colleagues, Decatur and Bainbridge. He advised combined action and the moving in squadrons, while they favored dispersion of the ships and "relying upon the enterprise of their officers." The Department endeavored to adopt both suggestions, with the natural consequence of failure to secure the benefits of either. It is observable that Capt. Mahan apparently sees no valid ground in the events of this war for changing his often-expressed opinion as to the inconclusive nature of privateering, a subject which he deals with fully and sympathetically in his Chapter XIV.: "The achievement of the naval vessels was to that of the private armed nearly as three to two. These results may be accepted as disposing entirely of the extravagant claims made for privateering as a system, when compared with a regular naval service." His Chapter V. is worth reading for its careful exposition of conditions at the moment hostilities began, both as to men and means, and especially for its definition of the author's point of view.

The touchstone of Sea Power is applied even to the operations on our Northern frontier during the entire war, which, despite their seeming confusion, are now shown by this form of analysis to have been consistent and coherent. We were oblivious, as Brock was alive, to its potency; hence his successes at Detroit and elsewhere, and our own failures until Perry's victory on Lake Erie, after which the Northwest returned to the American fold. While using this principle as a guide through the tangle of events, it must not be supposed that the author has written a thesis in its defence; yet its truth, assumed from the outset, is tested at every point.

With the varying phases and incidents of this war, we are all so familiar that a new writer can hope only to elucidate some rather obscure point, such as Elliott's conduct at the battle of Lake Erie, Lawrence's mental attitude when he engaged the *Shannon*, and the tactics of certain encounters on sea and land, unless, as is the case with Captain Mahan, he brings to bear some fresh method of analysis to stimulate on the part of the reader an interest which monotony of previous narration had somewhat dulled. In considering both sides of the struggle, Captain Mahan is impelled to remark that "it is in such study of reciprocal action between enemies that the lessons of war are learned and its principles established, in a manner to which the study of combats between single ships, however brilliant, affords no equivalent," unconsciously emphasizing the difference between himself and his predecessors. At the same time he goes minutely into the operations of the various campaigns, so that any one who cares may learn all the tactical incidents of each action.

He finds that the harrying of our coast towns and even the burning of our national capitol were less influential in producing a willingness on our part to end hostilities than the rigid commercial blockade established and maintained by the British south of Narragansett Bay. American commerce, it appears, dwindled rapidly until, in 1814, it was practically annihilated. A few ships of war, instead of Jefferson's preposterous gunboats, would have repaid their cost a hundredfold. The universal distress created by the close grip on our harbors and estuaries is mentioned by all the historians who write of this period, notably by McMaster and Henry Adams, but its value as a military measure is best exhibited by Captain Mahan. One might almost say that the distinguishing feature of this history of a famous war is the prominence given to the indirect effects of its less striking naval movements.

The final chapter, giving the details of the peace negotiations, is most interesting. Hampered by the arbitrary demands of the British Government, the commis-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sioners were unable to agree even when both countries were heartily tired of war. Happily, at the critical moment, the sensible counsels of the Duke of Wellington turned the scale, and a treaty was signed wherein not a single principle for which we had unsheathed the sword was even mentioned. Wise in its day, and establishing a precedent which might well be followed now, Downing Street insisted on ratification without change or amendment in any particular, thus wantonly depriving our Senate of a rare opportunity to display its ability to undo good work.

There were, throughout the struggle, gallant deeds on sea and shore reflecting credit on Americans and British alike, but the story is, after all, saddening. Like many wars, this was ill-considered and foolish; like most wars, it was entirely avoidable. Of a prudent making ready in advance, as the Japanese have recently done, there is no trace. Our strategy was faulty to the verge of childishness; our military leaders at the outset were superannuated and incompetent; our own people, divided in sentiment, were so keen after gain that they traded with the enemy whenever and however they could. Ruthlessly destroying Newark, Ontario, we provoked the legitimate response of Ross and his invading army in the burning of our national capitol. Having neglected to fill the ranks of our regular army in season, we trusted to a militia that, but too frequently, broke and ran after the first volley.

On the other hand, the impressment of seamen, though never formally abandoned as a right by Great Britain, has not been practised by her since the Treaty of Ghent. So discordant were the various communities in our political body, and so conflicting their interests, that one is tempted to believe, with the historian, that only through the external pressure exerted by a strong and somewhat unscrupulous enemy could they have been welded into a self-contained and interdependent State; the Revolution finding its complement in the War of 1812. The former freed us; the latter made us into a nation. Herein we find such consolation as we may in reading one of the most scholarly and absorbing in the series of recent American histories, and eminently worthy of a place on the library shelf beside the larger works of Henry Adams, McMaster, Rhodes, and Woodrow Wilson.

The Flower Book. By Sir Edward Burne-Jones. London: The Fine Art Society. 1905. 300 copies numbered; no further issue.

It seems impossible that color reproductions of water colors could be carried to greater perfection than in this 'Flower Book' facsimile by the firm of Piazza & Co., Paris. At the Society's rooms in Bond Street opportunity has been given to compare the reproductions with the original designs in the book itself. The lack of imaginative art at the present moment, when technique alone and truth to nature are aims held in view by most artists, to the exclusion of beauty, has been much commented on and deplored; it is therefore of immense benefit that this work, containing all the best qualities of imaginative design, should now be within reach of so many more people than before, and should stimulate individual effort in seekers after the ideal. To the unremitting two years' labor of Signor Piazza and the immense strides in the process of reproduction this good work is due.

'The Flower Book' was the pastime of Burne-Jones's holidays, in his home at Rottingdean-by-the-Sea. He delighted in collecting beautiful names of flowers, of which in many cases the meanings had been forgotten, and for which he found his own interpretation—for no flower appears in any of the pictures; they represent the subjects the names suggested. The designs are circular, six inches in diameter, painted in gouache (water color mixed with body color and gold) on Michallet rough paper. They were begun in 1882, and during sixteen years thirty-eight designs were completed. Many were left slightly sketched in pencil, but these are not reproduced. To quote from Lady Burne-Jones's introductory note:

"He began the series, keeping by him a list of beautiful names that he had met with, choosing subjects from among them from time to time. . . . And first he thought any lovely or romantic name would lend itself to his purpose, but soon found that it was not so, and that comparatively few were of use. Such as had too obvious meaning—as, for instance, Odin's Helen, or Fair Maid of France—he rejected because there was not any reserve of thought in them for imagination to work upon. A picture, he held, should be no faint echo of other men's thoughts, but a voice concurrent or prophetical. It was easy enough, he said, merely to illustrate, but he wanted to add to the meaning of words or to wring their secret from them."

Among these designs are some of Burne-Jones's most beautiful inventions, *e.g.*, Golden Gate," in which angels are bringing out the sun from the opened gates of heaven to shine on the world; "Morning Glories," in which angels of the Byzantine type, so characteristic of the master, are spreading out clouds at dawn; "Star of Bethlehem," where, in the midst of a rocky landscape, the kings in gorgeous apparel of red and blue and orange are making their way towards the tiny manger in the middle distance, above which shines the star. Splendid in solemnity are "Black Archangel," Satan, sitting enthroned amid flames: "Arbor Tristis," in which the base of the tree of the cross grows up through steps of bare rock against a twilight sky with a window-lighted city below. In some of the subjects we find the themes of Burne-Jones's pictures treated again entirely differently—"Witches Tree," for instance, in which we have Merlin and Nimue; "Golden Cup," representing the Holy Grail; and "Grave of the Sea" with the mermaid and her drowned lover; "Venus's Looking-Glass," in which the moonlight is beautifully rendered, shining into the lake and on the face of Venus. These pictures all have the atmosphere of fairyland; they are like visions of scenes in a crystal ball or magic mirror—creations of fancy full of spontaneity and beauty. They vary much in style, the later ones becoming more Byzantine in character.

The letterpress, consisting of an introduction by Lady Burne-Jones and short explanatory notes to each subject, has been done in script by Mr. Graily Hewitt, this form being considered more suitable to the delicacy of the drawings. The book is bound in dark-green sealskin, or the pictures can be had mounted in sunk mounts separately in a box. Some copies are bound with handtooled decoration designed by Mr. Douglas Cockerell in a more elaborate and costly style.

In the Name of the Bodleian. By Augustine Birrell. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1905.

The president of the Board of Education in the new Liberal Ministry is an expert in the composition of the semi-serious essay. Less frivolous and freakish than Mr. Andrew Lang, but quite as humorous, he writes with a penetrating acumen that has been happily fostered by his legal studies. What mythology and ethnology are to Mr. Lang, the law is to Mr. Birrell, a thing to be taken seriously in the many-colored medley of subjects that must be touched lightly or left alone—Hannah More, for example. At the end of the present volume, named none too attractively from the first of its twenty-seven essays, two have been slipped in that are purely legal—that on "Contempt of Court," and "5 Edward VII., Chapter 12"; the latter, at any rate, is too technical for its company, and had best have ended where it must have begun, in some legal periodical.

With these exceptions, the volume is fully equal in interest to its charming predecessors. It is mainly about books and bookishness, and many of the essays are sublimated book reviews. One of the most charming is "A Connoisseur," a description of the personality of Mr. Birrell's father-in-law, the poet Frederick Locker-Lampson. It is a delicately intimate tribute which will appeal to all readers of 'London Lyrics,' and should increase their number. The late owner of the famous Rowfant Library is best known by these lyrics and by his anthology, 'Lyra Elegantiarum,' a collection of occasional verses which was suppressed by Landor's publishers on a question of copyright. But Locker wrote, or rather compiled, besides these, a 'Patchwork' (the title reminds one of a famous Miscellany of Clement of Alexandria), published in 1879, which had no great circulation, but has proved a boon to many a pressman at a loss for quotations or anecdotes.

Now that Mr. Birrell has taken his place as a Cabinet Minister, adding yet another to England's admirable list of literary statesmen, it is amusing to read an essay written in 1898 and included in this collection, "Our Great Middle Class"—a backward review of Arnold's famous indictment, in 1871, of the English middle class. Mr. Birrell points out that Arnold's message in 'Friendship's Garland' was unheeded by the barbarian aristocrats, and unread (at four-and-sixpence a copy) by the working classes.

"No; it was the middle class, to whom Mr. Arnold himself belonged, who took him to honest hearts, stuck his photograph upon their writing-tables, and sounded his praises so loudly that his fame even reached the United States of America. . . . They did not mind being insulted; they overlooked exaggeration; they pardoned ignorance. Yet though meek in spirit they have not inherited the earth; indeed, there are those who assert that their chances are gone, their sceptre for ever buried. It is all over with the middle class. . . . The crowds that flocked to hear Cobden and Bright, that abhorred slavery, that cheered Kossuth, that hated the income-tax, are now watered down by a huge population who do not know, and do not want to know, what

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the income-tax is, but who do want to know what the Government is going to do for them in the matter of shorter hours, better wages, and constant employment. Will the rabble we wonde , prove as teachable as the middle class? . . . In the meantime it would be a mistake to assume that the middle class counts for nothing, even at an election. . . . As to ideas, have we got any new ones since 1871? . . . Would that we could revive Arminius, to tell us what he thinks of our new Ariel [Mr. Chamberlain] girdling the earth with twenty Prime Ministers, each the choicest product of a self-governing and deeply involved colony. Is it a vital or a vulgar idea?"

These essays are all short, abound in anecdote and gossip about literary men and politicians—there is an excellent one on Disraeli—and it would be a limited taste indeed that could not extract from them several half-hours of entertainment.

Les Troubles de Hollande à la Veille de la Révolution Française. By Henry de Peyster. Paris: Picard.

This is an extraordinarily thorough and minute study of Dutch affairs during the period 1780-1795. Throughout these fifteen years a series of crises, both domestic and international, distracted the Seven Provinces, and left them no alternative but that of settling their disputes by calling in the foreigner. M. de Peyster begins his survey of the situation by sketching the social life of the Dutch at this time, and then proceeds through an account of internal organization to a portraiture of the party leaders. After thus describing the general conditions which marked the domestic situation, he goes on to bring in foreign Powers, such as England. Prussia, and France. In a word, the monograph is a political study, but not in the narrowest sense of the word. The first chapter, for example, with its graphic delineation of Dutch society, might be wrested from the context and published with perfect propriety as an independent essay.

In the political portion of his narrative, M. de Peyster finds space to discuss each of the leading motives at great length: the trouble between the House of Orange and the middle class, the skill of Harris in bringing about the English alliance, the intervention of Prussia, the personal policy of Wilhelmina, and the appeal of the Dutch Democrats to France. As an individual figure, no one stands out so clearly in these pages as Van de Spiegel, Grand Pensionary after the Restoration of 1787. As for the Restoration itself, M. de Peyster calls it the first step on the sad path which eventually led Holland to its salvation. The indolence and apathy of the Dutch on the eve of the Revolution were almost incredible when one considers what the same race had accomplished three generations earlier. At the same time, the country was not without its grandiose aspirations, among which the chief was a project for bringing about a reunion of the seventeen provinces without the use of force or any considerable expenditure. Although the Republic had no real army and was in a bad financial position, it did not realize the extent of its own weakness until it suffered itself to become overshadowed by the influence of England. If Van de Spiegel is the most striking figure of the present piece, the most insignificant is William V. The ancient hold which the House of Orange had possessed upon the affection and allegiance of the masses could not be weakened even by his instability of character, but he managed to lose touch with the middle class altogether, while in his relations with Prussia there is a strong flavor of the burlesque.

In his remarks about the intervention of France, M. de Peyster shows great judgment and fairness of spirit. In 1795 the Dutch fancied that they really wished to secure something like solidarity with France. The exactions of the Directory soon dispelled this dream, and under the Empire the first plots which arose against Napoleon were hatched in Holland. It was then discovered that what was wanted was neither the friendship of England nor of France, but independence. What the Dutch gained from the French Revolution was not so much the birth of new institutions as a fresh stimulus to the democratic spirit, in the recognition of a new ideal to be sought through unity and equality. The régime of Stadtholder and oligarchy disappears before the new conception of a truer citizenship than that of the eighteenth, or even of the seventeenth, century.

This excellent work is solidly based upon a large accumulation of original materials, nor is it less thoughtful than learned.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Baldwin, James. Robinson Crusoe Written anew for Children.—Thirty More Famous Stories Retold. American Book Co.
Champault, Philippe. Phéniciens et Grecs en Italie d'après l'Odyssée. Paris: Ernest Leroux.
Disraeli, B. Lord George Bentinck. Dutton. $2 net.
Eaton, Arthur Wentworth. Poems of the Christian Year.—Acadian Ballads. Thomas Whittaker. $1 net.
Flores de España. Edited by C. Fontaine. American Book Co.
Gasiorowski, Waclaw. Napoleon's Love Story. Dutton. $1.50.
Harding, Samuel Bannister. Essentials in Mediæval and Modern History. American Book Co.
Jappe, Thomas H. Elements of German Grammar. American Book Co.
King, Henry Melville. Rev. John Myles. Providence: Preston & Rounds Co.
Lawson, Thomas W. Frenzied Finance. Vol. I.: The Crime of Amalgamated. The Ridgway-Thayer Co.
Little, Mrs. Archibald. Round about my Peking Garden. Philadelphia: Lippincott.
Moore, Mabel. Carthage of the Phœnicians. Dutton. $1.50.
Mott, Sarah M., and Maude B. Dutton. Fishing and Hunting. American Book Co.
Oxford English Dictionary. Edited by Dr. James A. H. Murray. Vol. VIII.: Reign-Reserve. Henry Frowde.
Poems and Extracts chosen by William Wordsworth. Henry Frowde.
Roden, Robert F. The Cambridge Press, 1638-1692. Dodd, Mead & Co.
Scott, Duncan Campbell. John Graves Simcoe. Toronto: Morang & Co.
Scott, Duncan Campbell. New World Lyrics and Ballads. Toronto: Morang & Co. 60 cents.
Shakespeare's Venus and Adonis. Facsimile of first edition. Edited by Sidney Lee. Henry Frowde.
Supplementary Papers of the American School of Classical Studies in Rome. Vol. I. Macmillan. $3.
Walpole, Horace. Letters. Edited by Mrs. Paget Toynbee. Vol. XVI., *Index*. Henry Frowde.
Waste Not, Want Not Stories. Retold by Clifton Johnson. American Book Co.
Wordsworth's Literary Criticism. Edited by Nowell C. Smith. Henry Frowde.
Wright, Theodore F. The Spiritual Exodus. Boston: Massachusetts New-Church Union.
Writings of Saint Francis of Assisi. Translated by Father Paschal Robinson. Philadelphia: The Dolphin Press. $1 net.
Yulee, C. Wickliffe. The Awakening. The Neale Publishing Co. $1.25.

Lankester's Extinct Animals

Profusely illustrated. $1.75 net (by mail $1.92).

"A charming book . . . the greatest learning combined with the utmost simplicity of expression . . . a book of intense interest."—*N. Y. Sun.*

"Would have taxed Huxley himself to talk as simply, instructively, and delightfully to young people . . . most lively reading for young or old."—*N. Y. Globe.*

HENRY HOLT & CO., N. Y.

ENGLISH METAL WORK
BY WILLIAM TWOPENY
Price, $6.00 net. Postage, 28 cents.

COINS OF ANCIENT SICILY
BY G. F. HILL, M.A.
Price, $7.50 net. Postage, 28 cents.

EDVARD GRIEG
BY H. T. FINCK
The only Biography of the composer.
12mo. Price, $1.00 net. Postage 8 cents. Illustrated.

JOHN LANE COMPANY, N. Y.
THE BODLEY HEAD, 67 Fifth Ave.

RECENTLY PUBLISHED

SHINTO (the Way of the Gods)

By W. G. ASTON. With 14 Illustrations reproduced from Japanese Wood Engravings. 8vo, $2.00 *net.*

*** The materials have been principally drawn from the older Japanese literature, which gives a tolerably complete picture of this religion as practised from the seventh (and doubtless long before) to the eleventh centuries of the Christian Era.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO., New York

Beethoven—Franklin—Rousseau:

KRUELL'S Portraits, wood-engraved in the highest manner of the art and printed on Japan paper, size 9x11 inches, market price Twenty Dollars each, now offered *at half rate* to subscribers on the books of the *Nation*, and sent, carriage free, on receipt of Ten Dollars.—Address
PUBLISHER OF THE NATION, New York.

THE BEST ANIMAL STORY
RED FOX: RED FOX:
By CHARLES G. D. ROBERTS
Author of "The Heart of the Ancient Wood," "The Kindred of the Wild," etc.

American Political History, 1763-1876

By ALEXANDER JOHNSTON
Edited and Supplemented by Jas. A. Woodburn

Professor of History and Political Science, Indiana University; Author of "The American Republic," "Political Parties and Party Problems in the United States," etc.

In two vols. (each complete in itself, indexed). Each, net $2.00.

1. **The Revolution, the Constitution, and the Growth of Nationality. 1763-1832**
2. **The Slavery Controversy, Secession, Civil War, and Reconstruction. 1820-1876**

These volumes present the principal features in the political history of the United States from the opening of the American Revolution to the close of the Era of the Reconstruction. They give in more convenient form the series of articles on "American Political History" contributed to Lalor's "Cyclopedia of Political Science, Political Economy, and Political History," by the late Professor Alexander Johnston.

Send for new Illustrated Catalogue.

G. P. Putnam's Sons, 27 & 29 West 23d St., N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED